

THE REDISCOVERY OF MORALS

By Henry C. Link

THE REDISCOVERY OF MAN

THE RETURN TO RELIGION

THE REDISCOVERY OF MORALS

THE REDISCOVERY OF MORALS

*WITH SPECIAL REFERENCE TO
RACE AND CLASS CONFLICT*

BY
HENRY C. LINK, PH.D.

AN AMERICAN MERCURY BOOK

E. P. DUTTON & COMPANY, INC.
NEW YORK

1947

COPYRIGHT, 1947
BY HENRY C. LINK
All rights reserved
PRINTED IN THE U.S.A.



FIRST EDITION

No part of this book may be reproduced in any form without permission in writing from the publisher, except by a reviewer who wishes to quote brief passages in connection with a review written for inclusion in magazine or newspaper or radio broadcast.

AMERICAN BOOK-STRATFORD PRESS, INC., NEW YORK

DEDICATED TO
THE YOUNGER GENERATION

in their struggle with the false
ideologies which older genera-
tions have thrust upon them.

FOREWORD

SOMETHING has obviously gone wrong with the world and with people generally.

What is it? And what can be done about it?

People everywhere are asking these questions and groping for reliable and practical answers. The answers given here grow largely out of my work in the fields of social and personal psychology. Here, as in all other sciences, it is becoming clear that we have too many facts and not enough ideals, too much knowledge and not enough principles. Psychologists, for instance, have discovered that the Intelligence Quotient is not nearly as important as they once thought. They are rapidly finding that personality and character are equally, if not more, important. They have found, for instance, that competitive games and sports are a major force in developing well-balanced, social personalities.

Such findings go to the very root of the problem of morals and social harmony, as I have tried to point out in *The Rediscovery of Man*, especially in its chapter on "The Psychology of Sportsmanship." Sportsmanship is probably the clearest and most popular expression of morals. Morals are the rules of the game, and sportsmanship means that cooperation according to the rules is more important than ruthless competition.

The Olympic Games represent a closer approach to the

principles of international harmony than do the United Nations. In the world today, too many people want to win regardless of the rules or the cost to others.

The findings of psychologists in respect to personality have enormous significance for the fields of economics, sociology, political science and ethics. Psychologists have not yet gone far in the social interpretation of their findings. Indeed, my own conclusions are probably far in advance of what most psychologists would agree with. The snowball is still small, but it is there.

In a recent column Howard Vincent O'Brien wrote as follows:

" . . . everything, these days, is minus some essential part. Life is like the unfinished houses you see everywhere —waiting for some missing nails or wire or pipe.

"There is an unceasing babble, these days, about politics and economics. Our foreign policy is concerned with other peoples' boundaries. At home, existence is sicklied over with the pale cast of labor unrest. Wherever you look, there's something missing.

"I think it is *morals*.

"We strive to get as much as possible for doing as little as possible; and we strive to gouge out of the buyer the most for the least. Simple honesty is rare enough for amazed comment. The thief has become respectable. The shadow of corruption hangs over the land. And poor witless clowns think they can do something about it by making agreements and passing laws. But the soul of man is sick. It will take more than this to cure him."

I am indebted to many for help in the preparation of this book, though for the views expressed I assume full

responsibility. In connection with the chapters on the facts about race differences, I am especially grateful to A. T. Poffenberger, professor of psychology at Columbia University and past president of the American Psychological Association; to Henry E. Garrett, head of the department of psychology at Columbia University and the retiring president of the American Psychological Association; and to Otto Klineberg, one of the foremost psychologists in the field of race differences.

I am indebted to The Psychological Corporation for permission to quote the results of one of its public opinion polls. The interpretation of this poll and other views on psychological matters expressed here are my own and not necessarily those of The Psychological Corporation.

For advice on certain statements about decisions of the Supreme Court, I wish to thank Walter N. Maguire. For help in connection with the considerable research required, I owe thanks to Dr. Sidney S. Roslow and Miss Nelle Kelly. For critical or inspirational advice on the manuscript as a whole, I am indebted to Dr. Ordway Tead, James Putnam, Turner Jones, Lawrence E. Spivak, Dr. Louis Finkelstein, and M. Ashby Jones.

I should especially like to acknowledge the valuable criticisms and suggestions made by Mr. and Mrs. Hamilton M. Warren in respect to every chapter of the book. I wish to express thanks to my former secretary, Mrs. Hilda Korn, for her help in preparing the manuscript and bibliography. I am more than usually indebted to my wife, not only for technical assistance but for steadfast inspiration in times of doubt and discouragement.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

<i>Foreword</i>	7
1. <i>A Program—Not a Formula</i>	17
The evidences of social discord—People not as bad as their ideologies—The cult of physical science—Of relativity in morals—Of economic equality—Moral significance of the atomic bomb—What are morals?—The author's prejudices or premises.	
2. <i>Race Conflict and the Dignity of Man</i>	28
De Tocqueville's prophecy for America—The public's expectancy of race riots—Why Germany persecuted the Jews—The dangers of a scapegoat psychology in America—Present attitudes toward Jews and Negroes—The "disease" theory of race prejudice—Social and economic equality not the whole answer—The basic causes of race conflict—The conception of the dignity of man—Ten Commandments a minimum basis for dignity—The American Creed and its moral significance—Recapitulation.	
3. <i>The Disintegration of Morals</i>	44
Laws of physical science supersede moral laws—Material wealth displaces ethical values—Secular education displaces religious education—Social sciences create the "economic man"—Germany, chief apologist for moral relativity—United States follows Germany—"Liberal" variants of religion and morals—Liberalism and the "classless society"—Racial equality in Russia and America.	
4. <i>What Is Class Conflict?</i>	58
The "haves" and the "have nots"—Class warfare depends on an ideology—Karl Marx and the scapegoat technique—Communism reverses Christian morals—Liberalism and the Communistic technique—Human rights versus property rights—Politician's use of scapegoat ideology—Unions and	

labor laws embody scapegoat ideology—The Supreme Court condones class conflict—The Supreme Court rules moral law illegal—Class hatreds breed race hatreds.

5. *What Are the Facts About Race Differences?* 74

Can facts eliminate race prejudice?—How facts can be used to create friction—The use of psychological tests—The boy with the low I.Q. and the determined mother—Race differences in intelligence—Why intelligence scores are misleading—Test scores depend largely on incentives—Incentives of the American Indians, Jews and Negroes—Tests of musical talent, personality, etc.—Test averages of races misleading—The real differences are between individuals, not races.

6. *Equality and the Common Man* 95

Equal opportunities and unequal results—Paradox of scientific vs. moral equality—Faith in the possibilities of the individual—Doctrine of equality the foundation of justice—Tragic exception of the Negro—The modern concept of equality and the common man—The common man portrayed as an economic victim—The ideology of the scapegoat—The defeatism of modern science—The uncommon man becomes the scapegoat—Confusing the profit system with the profit motive—Collective bargaining becomes collective *bludgeoning*—Two brands of justice and the resulting legal chaos—Equality under the traditional American Creed—The rise of the middle class—Russia adopts incentives once peculiar to America.

7. *Men of Good Will and Men of Good Sense* 122

How personal hatreds are transformed into mob violence—The Ku Klux Klan—Social equality and intermarriage—The difference between North and South—Local versus national action—Segregation in the schools—Applying the techniques of class warfare—Segregation in the Armed Forces—The President's Fair Employment Practice Committee—The New York State Anti-Discrimination Act.

8. *A Program for Race and Class Harmony* 136

Program of American Council on Race Relations—The dilemma of freedom and serfdom—The emphasis on people

rather than on race or class—Jim Crowism and the quota system—Jim Crowism and Palestine for the Jews—Discrimination based on union membership—Moral force rather than legal force—Major emphasis on education—Elementary teaching in human relationships.

9. *The Reform of Public Education* 154

Present emphasis on quantity of education—Statistics of crime and social conflict reveal present weakness—Critical findings of the Regents Inquiry—Ethical training in the public schools—Some schools are adopting moral codes—Restoring the rules of courtesy—The values vs. the facts of life—Ethics without sectarianism—Sportsmanship and racial equality—The semantics of loving one's neighbor—The ethics of the physical sciences—The teaching of American history—A liberal vocational education.

10. *The Possibilities of Religious Education* 178

Scientific studies prove its merits—America's moral momentum—What, then, should the Church Schools teach?—The relation between church and state—The dignity of man under the Ten Commandments—The social significance of Jesus' life.

11. *Legislation, Research and Policy Making* 189

Existing laws should be impartially enforced—The case for a permanent F.E.P.C.—How legislation creates discrimination and social strife—The Wagner Act and class conflict—A national research and policy-making group—The complexities of anti-discrimination laws—The need for further research.

12. *A Plea for Religious Intolerance* 206

The worship of toleration as such—The intolerance of Jesus—The churches and the Supreme Court—The Jews and the moral law—The significance of the new Social Gospel—How Communism and the Social Gospel differ—The futility of conferences without principles—A God without commandments worse than no God.

Bibliography 219

THE REDISCOVERY OF MORALS

1. A PROGRAM—NOT A FORMULA

WHILE children as well as adults have busily been promoting the machinery of international peace the warfare in our own nation between classes, races and individuals has grown alarmingly. It is as though we were looking through the wrong end of a telescope. The problems of the world look smaller while those under our nose are not even visible.

How can we hope to abolish world wars while we so utterly fail to cope with our conflicts at home? The frenzied pursuit of world peace may represent the desperate hope that, having established a framework for international unity, the solution of our domestic wars will automatically follow. More probably it is a glorified escape mechanism by which we avoid facing our failures at home. Never has this nation witnessed such a wholesale flight from the realities.

These realities include the most acute class warfare in the nation's history, with the highest rate of strikes and industrial conflicts on record. They include a continuously high rate of major crimes, surpassing all records among those under twenty-one and showing particularly sharp increases among juveniles. The divorce rate, certainly an aspect of social harmony, is at an all-time high, more than one in every five marriages, and promises in twenty years to be *one in every two* marriages. While comparable

records of race riots and crimes are lacking, it is widely held that racial tensions are higher and quarrels more frequent than they have been in decades.

Unless we can learn how to achieve peace in our relationships at home there can be little hope of maintaining peace abroad.

The growing attention to racial problems is encouraging. Race riots are still almost as rare as class conflicts are common; but we have become so accustomed to class warfare that we fail to see its ominous character. And yet, if our analysis is correct, race prejudice has become but another form of class prejudice and the causes and cures of both are the same. It is futile to attack the problems of race, as is the current practice, as though they were independent of the more basic problems of class hatreds.

The prospects of domestic and international peace are far from encouraging. The very destruction of the human race seems foreshadowed by recent events. Young couples are asking whether they do right to bring children into a world of such hatreds and strife. The great majority who refuse to face the facts are living in a fool's paradise. And yet, despite the horrors and injustice of our times, a certain type of optimism is not only warranted but essential to survival.

As a psychologist, dealing with people both as individuals and in the mass, the following conclusion has impressed itself upon me above all others: *people are not nearly as bad as their ideologies*. The worst devils of modern times are the false philosophies and theories which have taken possession of people. I am continuously

discovering that individuals are basically better than the education and the theories that have been literally thrust upon them.

This is not to subscribe to Rousseau's doctrine that man is by nature good, nor to contradict the opposite doctrine of man's natural depravity. By nature, man is both good and bad, and this is true of white or black, rich or poor. Whether he becomes better or worse as he matures depends, above all, on the ideas and ideals that dominate his time.

Somehow the ideas and theories which have gained ascendance in recent years are especially calculated to bring out the worst in human nature.

Many of us can still remember the German people as a pretty decent sort, honest, capable, good-hearted. And yet, under the ideology of National Socialism they became a nation of fanatical terrorists. The Jews had lived in honor among the Germans for centuries but suddenly, under Hitler's doctrine of the master race, they became the victims of merciless hatred and persecution.

These were the obvious ideologies which converted the Germans from virtuous people into demons. However, long before this the ground had been prepared by other German ideologies. One of these was the cult of physical science. The Germans had become obsessed with their mastery of chemicals, of artificial rubber, synthetic oil, aviation, jet propulsion. To the last, they put their trust in secret weapons which would destroy their enemies.

But even before this, their anthropologists and social scientists had developed and popularized the ideology of

the relativity of morals, the doctrine that right and wrong are different for different people at different times. Product of this philosophy was the *superman*, who makes his own laws in accordance with his own superior attributes. Hitlerism and the doctrine of the master race were founded squarely on the theories inculcated by German scholars during the nineteenth century in the great universities of Germany.

These ideologies have not been confined to Germany. Not Germany but the United States has perfected the atomic bomb and was the first to use it. The cult of physical science has made us the most materialistic and the most confident nation on the globe. We have more secret weapons, more power, than we know what to do with. Not only our enemies but we ourselves are confused by this great strength. To add to the confusion, we have swallowed the European ideology of the class struggle almost whole, and we teach the doctrine of the relativity of morals not only in our universities but in our high schools.¹

How can the ideologies which aggravate the natural greeds and hatreds of man be exposed and destroyed? How can the doctrines which encourage his natural loves and generousities be established? If all the ingenuity and reason of modern science has but led to a preponderance of destructive doctrines and instruments, what hope is there for the human race?

A ray of hope has recently appeared, one all the more encouraging because of its unexpected source. The third

¹ All references are to Bibliography, pages 219-223.

annual Conference on Science, Philosophy and Religion, consisting of a hundred scholars—sociologists, archaeologists, physicists, theologians, psychologists, psychiatrists, biologists, anthropologists, economists, etc.—concluded their five-day session with the remarkable statement that the economic and political catastrophes of our times were due to the intellectual confusion of modern science, its failure to recognize “the great inherited body of accepted truth,” and the consequent deterioration of moral and spiritual values.² The formal statement issued by this group included the following:

“ . . . Current political and economic dislocations culminating in the military threat of world conquest, are in large part the effects of world wide intellectual confusion and spiritual and moral deterioration. This deterioration of standards of thought and action affected society in its most sensitive aspects—namely, the fields of art, letters, philosophy and thought—long before the advent of the war. . . .”

This conclusion, remarkable if for no other reason than that scholars of so many different fields could agree, has had further important consequences. At the August, 1944, Conference, devoted to the subject of group tensions and national unity, unanimous agreement was reached on the basically moral character of the problem. In view of the major thesis of this book, that the causes and cures of social strife are moral rather than economic, the conclusions of the Conference have been most comforting to the author. No matter how certain one may be of his ground, it is not easy to write in a vein contrary to most of the current thought in this field.

The conclusions of these scholars are especially significant because they repudiate the most popular and ruinous of all modern ideologies. This is the doctrine that crime, race discrimination and class conflict are due primarily to economic inequality and insecurity. It is the doctrine that men cannot be good or live peacefully unless they have a guaranteed job and a guaranteed standard of living. This ideology is well calculated to capture the imagination and approval of the multitudes.

Few Americans would deny the desirability of a higher minimum standard of living, but to preach this as the basic condition of social harmony not only perverts the truth but aggravates race and class hatreds. It is hard enough for most of us to love our neighbors with the help of an inspiring philosophy. It becomes almost impossible when we are saddled with the doctrine that we cannot be good neighbors because we are underprivileged or insecure.

It is relatively easy to agree that race and class conflict are basically moral problems but from there on confusion usually prevails. The word *moral* is one to conjure with. It has a favorable connotation and because it confers prestige upon almost any argument, it is used frequently and often indiscriminately. A person who is above all criticism in his personal morals may be completely blind to their broader social meaning.

Moral, as we shall use the term here, refers to specific principles of conduct. The Golden Rule is a moral principle but, because it makes the individual his own standard of values, it is not objective enough to stand alone. To say

that all we need to achieve peace is to follow the Golden Rule is as naive as to say that all we need to do in order to fly is to follow the law of gravity. The same may be said of the Old Testament commandment, *Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself*. To the strong this may mean lifting up the weak; to the weak it may mean pulling down the strong.

These two precepts depend, for their moral validity, upon more specific and objective moral laws such as, for instance, the Ten Commandments. However, the Ten Commandments are far from exhausting the possibilities of the moral law. They do not include, for instance, the precept: Thou shalt not discriminate against thy neighbor because of his race or creed. The simple fact is that, while scientific principles have been developed to the utmost, moral principles have been relatively neglected. Therefore, it would be naive to assume that the moral solution of social conflict is nothing more than a return to the Ten Commandments or the two great commandments. Nevertheless, in this day of "intellectual confusion and moral deterioration" these commandments are still the best foundation on which to build.

The great task ahead is to duplicate in the field of morals what we have so brilliantly done in the field of physical science. With all our education and intellectual progress we are still at the stage where every individual is encouraged to create his own moral order. We have even repudiated, through the doctrine of moral relativity, the concept of universal moral laws. The Ten Commandments, for instance, are held to be merely the folkways

peculiar to a certain time and people. So it is, according to modern thinking, with all moral laws. They are customs, conventions, *mores* of temporary and limited validity. Each nation, therefore, is entitled to its own moral code no matter how temporary!

The significance of the atomic bomb is not so much its promise of physical death to come as its proof of the moral death which has already overtaken mankind. The atomic bomb dramatizes what has been going on for generations, the pursuit of physical science and the neglect of moral science, the emphasis on facts rather than on values. The atomic bomb represents the discoveries of physical science, two billion dollars' worth of hard, precise, incontrovertible facts in the last few years alone.

The decision as to how to use this bomb, or whether to use it at all, must be made according to a standard of values or moral truth. This kind of truth is as yet anything but factual or precise in the scientific sense. And yet, no conventions or agreements for the control of atomic energy are worth the paper they are written on without it. Indeed, though we must use it, this standard has become shabby and almost unrecognizable through neglect. No two billion dollars has been devoted in recent years, or in a great many years, to codifying and modernizing the elementary moral values developed by the human race through the ages. No effort corresponding to that to establish scientific truth has been made to establish the equal if not greater importance of moral truth. Moral truth today, as five thousand years ago, is still largely the subject of revelation rather than investigation.

In view of the existing confusion, any systematic thinking in this field must proceed from certain premises or hypotheses. Furthermore, this subject has become so controversial and emotional, that any premises are likely to be condemned as personal prejudices. Therefore, the author wishes to enumerate his principal assumptions or prejudices at the very outset.

First of these is the premise that moral laws are just as inherent in the nature of people as are physical laws in the nature of matter.

Corollary to this is the belief that these laws are just as universal as is, for example, the law of gravity. No matter what the superficial differences between people they are basically the same and subject to the same laws. The doctrine that all men are created equal is an expression of this belief.

A further corollary is the belief that these moral laws apply equally to all nations, races and individuals. If not, there can be no basis for social harmony, any more than there can be stability in the physical world if the law of gravity operates in one way in Mexico and another way in Canada.

Another premise is that these laws are relatively permanent rather than temporary. Times and customs may change, but the basic moral laws are just as changeless as the law of gravity or the axioms of mathematics. Even Einstein's definition of relativity has not changed the essential law of gravity or the axiom that things equal to the same thing are equal to each other.

According to the moral law, the end does not justify

the means even though that end be called *social justice* or *the general welfare*. The doctrine, so popular in our time, that our "social objectives are more important than the exact methods by which they are attained" is the complete antithesis of all morality. This doctrine permits every individual to decide which ends are good and what means he may choose to attain them.

Moral law, as here conceived, provides standards of conduct without being capricious or authoritarian. There is no more compulsion or authoritarianism in the moral law than there is in the multiplication table or in the law of gravity. A man is free to defy the moral laws just as he may defy the laws of physics and arithmetic, even though he cannot escape the consequences. If he develops the habit of constant lying he will destroy his personality just as surely as the habitual use of opium will destroy his body.

It is only in relation to the moral law that the individual can have freedom and the dignity that goes with freedom. *The dignity of man* is a moral concept. Man's dignity is directly dependent on his rights or freedoms. To the extent that he is regimented and taken care of by a benevolent State he loses both in freedom and in dignity.

The nationalization or socialization of private property and the means of production is a major step toward large-scale regimentation. Socialism does not abolish capitalism or the profit system, it merely transfers it from the individual to the State. Thus the responsibility for the creation or abuse of capital is also transferred from the individual to the State. This means an extensive repudiation

of morals, for, under private capitalism, individuals are and can be held morally and legally responsible. Under socialism or state capitalism, there is only one great corporation and, since everyone is in it, whatever it does, no matter how disastrous, is everybody's responsibility. What is everybody's responsibility is nobody's responsibility.

It is our belief that the world-wide tendency toward the socialist or communist State is due to the failure of ethical research to keep pace with physical research. The whole world has become one in its ambition for the more abundant material life but is anything but homogeneous in its understanding of the moral laws which must control these ambitions.

These assumptions of ours are by no means original. The moral law as described by our hypothesis reached its highest expression thus far in Judaism and Christianity and its highest political development in the American Creed and its Constitution. "Democracy," said Justice Brandeis in 1923, "substitutes self-restraint for external restraint. It demands continuous sacrifice by the individual and more exigent obedience to the moral law than any other form of government." It is the rediscovery and reinterpretation of moral law which constitutes the major problem of our civilization.

2. RACE CONFLICT AND THE DIGNITY OF MAN

THE NEED for a social interpretation of morals is nowhere more apparent than in the field of race prejudice and race conflict. More than a hundred years ago the French nobleman, Alexis de Tocqueville, in his remarkable book, *Democracy in America*,³ prophesied: "If ever America undergoes great revolutions, they will be brought about by the presence of the black race on the soil . . . that is to say they will owe their origin not to the equality but to the inequality of condition." Thirty years later the Civil War took a toll of lives not equalled until the second World War. However, the United States emerged strengthened rather than weakened in the essential character of its republican democracy.

Since then the Negroes have made great, though uneven, progress toward equality with the whites. Since then, also, new millions of immigrants representing many nationalities and cultures have come to these shores. My own parents were among them. Not only did these newcomers share equally in the privileges and rights of this nation; they participated in its rapidly rising standards of living, of free education, and in its growing public facilities not to say public luxuries. There were group conflicts and social injustice to be sure, but in the main there was social unity and increasing equality.

Now this situation has undergone an ominous change and De Tocqueville's warning seems more timely than

ever. In addition to the higher tensions between whites and Negroes, prejudice has grown sharply in respect to other American minorities such as the Japanese, the Jews, the Mexicans. Campaigns of hate and distrust have been waged against all of these groups. Today many of the closest students in this field are convinced that serious racial warfare lies ahead. Large parts of the American public have the same conviction.

In a nation-wide survey ⁴ of public opinion conducted not long ago, this question was asked: "Do you feel that race riots in the United States, the molesting of churches and synagogues, and attacks on members of a different race, are going to happen more often or less often in the next few years?"

40% thought that race riots would occur more often.

34% thought that race riots would occur less often.

26% were uncertain.

The very recognition of this possibility is an important step toward making it less possible. Other aspects of the public's awareness of race tensions are shown by the *Fortune* magazine polls ⁵ and the reports of the National Opinion Research Center of the University of Denver.⁶

Many efforts are already being made to eradicate race prejudice and discrimination. Some of these efforts are doing more harm than good. They threaten to create the very conflicts they are intended to prevent. If we and our children are to escape the evil days which now seem ahead, there must be a much broader grasp of these problems than prevails now.

The exhaustive and scientific studies of racial problems made in the past are today largely inadequate. This is so because the most dangerous aspect of race prejudice is no longer race prejudice but something quite different. A new element has been added, or perhaps, an ancient element has been revived with scientific efficiency. This is the large-scale use of race prejudice as a means to political power. In its extreme form it is the use of race tensions to inflame people to actions which lead to dictatorship and totalitarian government.

If all Jim Crowism or race discrimination were done away with today, this most serious aspect of the racial problem would still be with us. Race has become a psychological device which politicians and demagogues have learned to use as a means to power. This is the element in race conflict which most needs to be recognized and understood today. Its workings have been most clearly revealed by Nazi Germany. If we understand its operation there, we can better recognize its operation here. The Jews, though a people and not a race, were made the victims of a racial theory.

Japan, imitating Germany, implemented her war of conquest with the same psychological weapon. "Asia for the Asiatics" became her war cry, even though she had been making war on the Chinese for years. No matter how complete the conquest of Japan, this slogan may live for generations and breed many more wars between the East and the West.

The persecution of the Jews in Germany was really more a class than a race conflict. The Jews were rich, said

Hitler, not because they were superior but because, by unscrupulous cunning, they had deprived the ordinary German of his just share. They had taken slick advantage of the mass of German workers who, by their back-breaking labor, had really created the wealth. Therefore, said Hitler, the Germans, in dispossessing the Jews, were merely taking back the wealth that was theirs in the first place. In short, Hitler used the Jews as the scapegoat for the economic woes of the German masses. They were the victims which he sacrificed to the God of National Socialism who was to bring happiness and security to the German masses.

If Germany could make so much of the race problem out of so little, what might not the United States do with so much? No country in the world consists of large racial groups so different in origin and culture, and so recently brought together. The book, *One America*,⁷ by Brown and Roucek, gives specific data on more than sixty racial and cultural groups. As compared with a million or less Jews in Germany, there are more than five million in the United States. There are about fifteen million Negroes. Almost 40 per cent of our population is of English or Scotch derivation; 16 per cent of German origin, 11 per cent Irish, 4 per cent Polish, 4 per cent Italian, 4 per cent Swedish and Norwegian. We have appreciable groups of Dutch, French, Russian, Czechoslovakian, and lesser groups of Mexican, Japanese, Chinese, and American Indians.

In spite of this situation, no race ideology comparable with that of Nazism has developed or shown signs of developing until recently. In the nation-wide survey already

mentioned ⁴ people were asked: "Against which racial or religious groups, if any, do you think that prejudice or feeling has increased most?"

Only two groups were mentioned with any degree of frequency, Negroes and Jews. This question was not intended as a measure of race prejudice, but merely as an introduction to the next question which was: "What do you think are the reasons for this prejudice?"

An analysis of the reasons given for prejudice against the Jews and Negroes reveals these significant facts. First, there are no signs of any consistent racial theory or ideology such as marked Nazism. The reasons given range over a wide field and are expressed in original and widely divergent phrases. There are few common terms or symbols such as characterize a highly developed ideology. Moreover, the reasons given in respect to the Negroes are quite different from the reasons given in respect to the Jews.

The analysis of the reasons given reveal this consistent pattern. The Negroes are regarded as an inferior race who are creating friction by their struggles to achieve equality. The Jews are considered a superior race who have created friction by their successful efforts to achieve wealth and power. The Negroes are often described as unstable, shiftless, lazy, sometimes arrogant; whereas the Jews are often described as mercenary, overaggressive, unscrupulous, unethical.

In short, these prejudices are exactly what one might expect, human nature being what it is, in respect to any race which, coming from below, was striving desperately

and sometimes clumsily to improve its lot; or, on the other hand, against any racial group or class which, by unusual effort or aggressiveness, had achieved more than average success. This does not make the situation any less serious. It is the perfect ground for a scapegoat ideology by which well-meaning or unscrupulous demagogues make economic warfare in the guise of race conflict.

As Hitler induced the Germans to blame the Jews for the griefs and mistakes of the German people, so now many good Americans are being induced to blame the Negroes, the Jews, the Fascists, the Communists or the capitalists for the mistakes and misdeeds of the American people at large. This involves the mechanism which psychologists call *projection*, a technical term for *alibiing*, or *passing the buck*. Often it is described as *using a scapegoat*. By whatever name, it reflects the common inability or refusal to face unpleasant realities or to assume responsibility for one's own guilt. This is a tendency as old as human nature.

Konrad Heiden, in his analysis⁸ of Hitler and Nazism, points out that if the German people had been sufficiently honest or realistic, they could not have been persuaded by Hitler to take the easy way out, that of blaming the Communists and the Jews. "In the long run," says Heiden, "only those can be coerced who really want to be." This is a perfect comment on the doctrine held by some that the German people as a whole were not accountable for Hitler, his persecution of minorities and the enslavement of smaller nations.

It is also the perfect answer to all those who wish to

relieve the American people as a whole from full accountability for race riots, strike violence, mob action or from accountability for any leadership which might provoke them. Those who continually cry "Fascism" or "Communism," no matter how sincere, may be confusing the real issues and obscuring the true causes.

What are these causes? Their nature and relative importance must be understood before the efforts to abolish race conflict can be successful. Many movements and elaborate programs aimed at race harmony have been initiated recently but some of them, quite obviously, have increased rather than decreased race tensions. This is due largely to the failure to analyze and to appraise correctly the psychological factors involved.

The "Disease" Theory of Race Prejudice

For example, there is a considerable school of thought, including psychiatrists, psychoanalysts, and even psychologists, who consider race prejudice as an illness. They describe it in terms of phobias, manias, hysterias, inferiority and superiority complexes, frustrations, and similar terms. It is, says one writer, "the dangerous mental and emotional disease of our time, more serious than typhoid or tuberculosis." "Prejudice in any person," says another, "is a kind of illness the fundamental basis of which is fear—the fear of economic insecurity, the fear of being rejected because one does not belong to the group, the fear that grows out of isolation and segregation, the fear of one's own impulses that are released in mob spirit and

riot, and the fear of loss of dominance of one's group." Another calls it a sickness born of the depression, saying, "They lived in beaten families. That beaten quality comes out later in some anti-social act, such as vandalism and racial intolerance."

All such explanations muddy rather than clarify the problem. They stem from the mechanistic, deterministic concept of mental illness so fashionable in our time, according to which people are completely the victims of circumstance, rather than responsible moral agents. Moreover, taken at their face value, the above explanations are inadequate or untrue. The most articulate and active race prejudice exists often among those who have never suffered the fears of social or economic insecurity, and who do not know what it is to be isolated or rejected by the group. In the South, for example, race prejudice is often stronger among the secure and successful whites than among the poor whites.

The Theory of Economic Determinism

Most discussions, however, attribute race tensions to more specific causes. The book, *Race Riot*,⁹ by Lee and Humphrey, is a good example. Among the causes considered most important are: inadequate housing and overcrowding; Jim Crow cars and racial discrimination in public facilities, including schools, libraries and hotels; political discrimination, including the poll tax; unequal educational facilities; discrimination in wage, job, and professional opportunities; segregation of Negroes in the

armed forces and of Negro blood in blood banks; the war and its attendant dislocations and tensions; the Ku Klux Klan and other pressure groups, including inflammatory publications; juvenile delinquency due to slums and inadequate recreational facilities.

These causes are all real and important and call for desirable remedies. But reforms are being directed almost exclusively to economic causes. If, in our discussion, we seem to underestimate these remedies, it is only because they fail to reach certain primary or underlying causes. That is to say, if all these socio-economic causes were remedied, the basic problem of race prejudice would still exist.

Specifically, if the Negro race could be given at once complete economic, political, and social equality, the main problem would not have been solved. The Jews in Germany, a small minority, had all these equalities, and yet they became the victims of the most violent oppression. The Jews in America have had these equalities for years and yet prejudice against them has reached dangerous proportions. If the Negroes were suddenly to gain, through Federal legislation and large funds, all the privileges and comforts they now lack, the likelihood of race conflicts might be increased rather than decreased.

Several months after this chapter was first written, the statement just made, as well as the basic thesis of this book, received interesting confirmation from a large body of the nation's leading scholars. The Conference on Science, Philosophy and Religion,¹⁰ after five days' discussion of sixty-four papers on group tensions and unity in

a modern world, publicly announced its unanimous agreement on two basic principles.¹¹ It affirmed its belief that discrimination could be overcome by "the development of a sense of fellowship which will embrace those who are different from us together with those who resemble us." Second, it gave as one of the chief barriers to social harmony "our failure to apply the moral principles of human dignity and mutual respect in our relations to one another."

The statement called on men of learning to "deal with *basic* rather than *superficial* issues" and to "discover *real* rather than *apparent* difficulties." (italics ours) In this connection it said: "*Nothing is more definitely established with regard to human relations than that the obliteration of all the real differences among peoples would not affect the problem of group tensions. If differences did not exist they would be imagined or invented. We are a divided people not because there are differences among us; it is rather that we emphasize the significance of the differences because we are a divided people.*"

What, then, are the underlying causes of race conflict? The answer is a paradox.

The basic causes of race conflict are not the differences between races, but the forces in respect to which all races and all individuals are alike. They are the forces common to all human nature in all ages and in all parts of the world. They are passion and anger, deceit and falsehood, jealousy and envy, laziness and gluttony, greed and covetousness, pride and selfishness, ignorance and complacency. These traits are common to white and black,

rich and poor, secure and insecure, privileged and underprivileged, educated and ignorant. These are the tendencies in respect to which all men are *the common man*. They are inherent in the physical and materialistic nature of every man and woman.

Education may modify or obscure, but it can never eradicate these elementary tendencies. In fact, education often helps these forces to express themselves more destructively under new and socially acceptable names. For example, in the older psychology, they were called instincts, the instincts of pugnacity, of acquisitiveness, of sex, jealousy, fear, hunger, and many others. In the newer psychology we call the same forces *drives* and *frustrations*. In psychoanalysis we call them suppressed desires, the libido, the id, the ego, the subconscious, and many other fancy names. Whatever the names, these human forces, though capable of the highest expression, are destructive when not rightly conditioned or controlled.

Basic Forces Conditioning Human Nature

The primary forces which help to restrain or condition these anti-social tendencies are moral rather than intellectual, religious rather than economic, spiritual rather than physical. The dogma that all men are created equal, for instance, was an irrational religious ideal which was advanced in the very face of the obvious fact that people have always been unequal. Based upon the belief that all men are the sons of God, this ideal stands far above the

petty weights and measures by which science now struggles to demonstrate its arithmetical validity.

The Old Testament commandment, Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself, is a religious, moral and spiritual dogma which transcends all economic and social expediencies. Without this basic conviction and its moral corollaries, all mechanical plans for racial harmony, no matter how fine the houses or wide the spaces, are bound to fail. The dignity of man is historically a religious and moral concept.

The Conception of the Dignity of Man

This phrase, *the dignity of man*, is much mouthed these days by writers with a sentimental hang-over from a religious past. These thinkers seek to confer dignity on all men like a new pair of pants or a set of modern plumbing. Their thesis is that if all men are given a certain standard of living and economic security, their undignified actions will cease. They are not realistic enough to see that man is, by nature, undignified, no matter what his wealth or poverty; that he has no dignity except in relation to some moral order or set of spiritual values which lifts him above his natural barbarism. Jesus was never more dignified than when he stooped to wash his disciples' feet.

The two great commandments and their corollaries, the Ten Commandments, are the Judaeo-Christian definition of man's dignity. The first element in the dignity of man is his devotion to the Concept of Dignity, as called for by the "first and great commandment." The second element

in the dignity of man is his respect for the dignity of others. It is impossible to love one's neighbor or respect his dignity without respecting, *as a minimum*, the further moral laws:

Honor thy father and thy mother.

Thou shalt not kill.

Thou shalt not commit adultery.

Thou shalt not steal.

Thou shalt not bear false witness against thy neighbor.

Thou shalt not covet . . . anything that is thy neighbor's.

These are the most elementary moral laws aimed at the most elementary anti-social drives of mankind. The relaxation of these laws makes possible race riots, the desecration of churches, and violence to people and their belongings. Just as man's natural passions or drives are the primary cause of personal, racial, and class conflict, so the moral laws are an indispensable foundation of social harmony at any level.

The American Creed and Its Moral Significance

The history of the United States, until recently, is the glorious record of the triumph of these moral laws over economic forces, and of a religious concept of life over materialistic and pagan philosophies. Specifically, it is the triumph of the Judaeo-Christian concept of the dignity of man as embodied in the American Creed. It is sad but significant that this fact has almost been lost sight of by the American people. Two of our chief reminders in re-

cent years have come from foreigners. One of them is an Englishman, Dr. D. W. Brogan, professor of political science at Cambridge University, whose book, *The American Character*,¹² might well be read in American history courses. The other is a Swede, Dr. Gunnar Myrdal, whose analysis of the American Creed and its Christian morality is the very heart of his monumental work¹³ on the Negro problem in America.

"Anything that obscures the fundamentally moral motives of the social problem," says John Dewey in his book, *Freedom and Culture*,¹⁴ "is harmful, no matter whether it proceeds from the side of the physical or the psychological theory." *The fundamentally moral nature of race and class unity in the United States has unquestionably been obscured by modern theory.*

The settlers who came to these shores, and they were of many races and religions, came to find opportunity and freedom from oppression. In most cases they found it, whether in hut or mansion, in poverty or plenty. The United States grew up and grew great under the majestic ideal expressed in the Declaration of Independence: "We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain inalienable rights, that among these rights are Life, Liberty, and the pursuit of Happiness."

These truths could have been self-evident only to men who already believed in a Creator. In the face of the evident inequalities of men, it was self-evident to them that all men were equal insofar as all were the children of God. The political views of our forefathers grew out of their

religious convictions, and not vice versa. They believed in a moral order and a moral law far more authoritative than any king, dictator, or political system. All the great Americans, from John Winthrop and George Washington to John Brown and Abraham Lincoln, testify to this fact. They embodied their concept of human dignity in a Constitution which gave us, not a Democracy but a Republic, a limited democracy. They knew that in a democracy the majority could be wrong. The majority could, unless restrained, vote away the rights, the properties, the freedoms of any minority. In fact, they could vote away their own dignity as free men and place themselves once more in the age-old status of regimented slaves or semi-contented government cows.

Therefore, our forefathers inscribed the currency of the realm, not with the slogan, "In Democracy we trust," not with the announcement, "In our Government we trust," or "In our President we trust." They did not trust any of these beyond definite limits. They inscribed it with the words, "In God we trust." These words, still appearing on every cent, nickel, dime, quarter, half-dollar, silver dollar, are the stereotyped reminders of the religious and moral ideals which shaped this nation.

The magnificent, if only partial, achievement of these ideals has been our country's unique contribution to world history. Nowhere have such divergent races, religions and traditions lived in such harmony and together made so much progress. This is a matter of history. The future is open to serious doubt.

To recapitulate, the basic causes of race conflict are the

selfish and anti-social tendencies common to all men regardless of race or class. To the extent that these impulses are conditioned by a moral code which defines the dignity of the individual social harmony prevails. When the authority of this code declines, social strife increases.

As man's anti-social drives are released he inevitably devises high-sounding ideologies to rationalize his barbarisms. Thus the Germans idealized their persecution of the Jews in the name of purity of the race and their enslavement of small nations in the name of "a new world order." Such ideologies—and the world is full of them—galvanize individuals who are only ordinarily bad into mobs which are extraordinarily bad. They convert the scattered forces of evil into highly organized machines of destruction. The results are race riots, class warfare and international wars.

3. *THE DISINTEGRATION OF MORALS*

EVENTS SINCE the Civil War have proved that political and physical force is a disastrous and ineffective substitute for moral and spiritual power. The freeing of the slaves gave only partial freedom to the Negro. His great progress since has been due to, though not commensurate with, the American Creed of equality and brotherhood.

The newly acute Negro problem today, according to Gunnar Myrdal,¹³ arises from the discrepancy between the American Creed with its Judaeo-Christian morality, and the white man's actual behavior. If the whites were to live up to their ideals, he claims, the Negro problem would disappear. The Negro problem is really the white man's problem.

What Myrdal does not point out is the extent to which the moral foundations of the American Creed have been undermined and sabotaged, not only in America but throughout the world. The problem of the Negro is a symptom of a much larger problem. All over the world racial, class and national hatreds have been increasing. The most destructive war in the history of man has demonstrated this fact.

Something has gone wrong with the world. This something goes much further than the evils of Germany and Japan. It is so deep and widespread that the winning of the war has not cured it. No matter what the peace, the

war has hastened the stirring up of hatreds everywhere.

That something which has gone wrong, in the opinion of many, is the disintegration of the primary forces which made for harmony between people in the past, namely, the forces of religion and ethics. Many sins have been committed in the name of religion and the church. Nevertheless, religion, throughout all history, has fought the uphill battle against the natural barbarism of man.

Religion has consistently struggled to establish ethics or morals as a universal way of life rather than a lesson in expediency. Its resources, its mysticism, supernaturalism, emotional dogmatism, ritualism and symbolic splendor, were employed to vitalize the commandments, the moral laws. Now, in an incredibly short time—roughly, the past one hundred years—the authority accumulated by religion through the ages, at least the Judaeo-Christian religion, has been largely destroyed, and with it also the authority of its moral precepts.

This destruction can be attributed partly to one of the most constructive and exciting developments in the history of man, the spread of physical science. Physical science, that is, physics, biology and chemistry, has given us in this short time the telephone, electric light, the automobile, rubber, rayon, the movies, the radio, the airplane, X-ray, antiseptic surgery, and untold physical blessings. However, the great increase in the authority of science has brought about a corresponding decrease in the authority of religion. The worship of hard facts has replaced the worship of spiritual symbols. Intellectual scepticism has taken the place of tradition and faith.

Because of my book, *The Return to Religion*,¹⁵ I have often been asked whether the world's problems would not be solved by a return to the "old-time religion." My answer has always been a positive "no." Natural science has exposed the trappings and barnacles of most religions beyond a doubt. However, through its methods and revelations science is now contributing to a grander and more authoritative religion than we have ever known, as I have tried to point out in a subsequent book, *The Rediscovery of Man*.¹

Much of the superstition and supernaturalism of the old-time religions deserved to be swept away, but in the avalanche the good suffered with the worthless. *The demonstrable laws of science attained absolute authority, while the moral laws, the Commandments, were relegated to the category of folklore.*

Religious education, which once included considerable instruction in the ethical commandments, was increasingly replaced by secular education, even in the religious and parochial schools. Secular education, when it taught morals at all, emphasized the relativity of right and wrong as customs or traditions peculiar to an age or race. The net result is the quite common belief that there are no universal moral laws, no commandments which apply to all people alike.

Suddenly we now find that at least one of the causes of race animosity has been the failure to teach children a respect for others. This awakening has led to a widespread discussion and recommendation of such exceptional programs as the "Springfield Plan." It is strongly urged, for

instance, that children in the elementary grades be taught never to apply *derogatory names* to members of another race, and never to repeat rumors. For example, a Negro is a Negro or a colored person, not a *nigger*; a Jew is a Jew, not a *kike* or a *sheeny*; an Italian is an Italian, not a *wop* or a *dago*; Irish are Irish, not those *dirty* Irish.

The current interest in this principle reveals that its importance is just being rediscovered. Its exponents seem largely unaware that it was formulated thousands of years ago as the commandment, *Thou shalt not bear false witness against thy neighbor*. (Not once have I seen this commandment quoted or referred to in the many learned and popular discussions of race conflict.) Its repudiation in the past by the process we have just described has encouraged the very name calling to which educators are now awakening, and not only in the racial field, but, as we shall some day realize, in many others, especially the realm of class conflict.

What happened to the ninth commandment has happened to all the commandments. Hastening the process has been the miraculous speed at which the physical sciences and private capitalism have multiplied material wealth, especially in the Americas. In the United States in 1945, more than half of all families had an automobile, 90 per cent owned one or more radios, 60 per cent owned mechanical refrigerators, 89 per cent had electric lights, 70 per cent had bathrooms. The magazines, the radio, and especially the movies, painted the picture of luxurious living in the minds of all peoples. *Thus, science has stimulated the senses, the acquisitiveness, the covetousness of*

people to an unprecedented degree at the very time that moral restraints were being displaced. The rich in America became the envy of the less wealthy, and the average American became the envy of the world.

As the materialistic desires of nations and individuals grew more intense, the forces of law and morality grew weaker. The social sciences, instead of helping to bridge this gap, did just the opposite. Whereas the physical sciences had undermined religion and morals by accident, the social sciences completed the process by intent. By the social sciences we mean psychology, anthropology, economics, political science, and sociology. History, ethics, and philosophy are sometimes included.

These fields even today are more speculative than scientific, more controversial than factual. The great gaps in their scientific controls permitted them to become the intellectual vehicles for wishful thinking. Through their undeserved scientific prestige, derived from the deserved authority of the physical sciences, the headlong materialism of the age was rationalized into an acceptable fiction of *the economic man*. The dignity of man was defined by his standard of living rather than by his spiritual and moral standards. If he became a drunkard, beat his wife, neglected his children, became a gangster, or participated in race riots, it was because he was the victim of an adverse economic environment. Only better housing, a private bathroom, a guaranteed income, and similar measures could prevent such tendencies. In short, the social sciences, through the high schools and colleges, became the powerful instrument of pseudo-scientific propaganda in

behalf of a purely materialistic and deterministic concept of man.

This involved the systematic repudiation of Judaeo-Christian ethics. When ethics was taught, it was as a dialectic in expedience, an exercise in different systems of ethics—the Stoic, the Epicurean, the Christian, the utilitarian, the Nietzschean. From these schools of ethics the student was invited to take his choice.

This was mild compared with the prevailing doctrine of the relativity of morals. For example, before the last war, one of the most popular professors in the college I attended, an anthropologist, taught me, and about 10,000 other students in his time, that moral laws were only the *folkways*, the *customs*, the *mores* peculiar to a certain tribe and time. Right and wrong, he taught, were not a matter of moral laws applicable to all people by nature. Right was decided by might, by the extent to which the strongest tribe or nation could impose its own *order* upon the rest of the world. In short, a sound German doctrine, on the basis of which Germany has twice in a generation plunged the world into war.

Germany, Chief Apologist for Moral Relativity

This doctrine, *the relativity of morals*, has been and is being taught in many guises by the social sciences in this country. A library could be written on this subject alone. However, it was given its great impetus by the social scientists and philosophers of Germany. It is no accident that Germany, to whose great universities our students once flocked for their doctor's degrees, should so com-

pletely repudiate Martin Luther and the Bible. It is no coincidence that Germany, a hundred years ago the supreme nation in physical and social science, should be the first in modern times to reject international morality with the cynical words, "a scrap of paper." It is wholly logical that Germany, whose technical and scientific school system was unexcelled, should be the first nation to proclaim a *new order* based on the commandment: *Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself, but only if a member of the German Aryan race!* It was inevitable that Germany should violate the basic moral laws as so dramatically described by ten famous authors in their book, *The Ten Commandments*.¹⁶

The decay of morals in the United States has been slower than in Germany because of our heritage in the American Creed, and because of the completeness with which our forefathers inculcated their religious and moral beliefs in the political and educational framework of the nation. Our liberal arts education, as set up in the religious colleges of Colonial days, has been a part of this heritage. Yale, Harvard, Princeton, and the early Colonial colleges were established by religious bodies, and their faculties for many years consisted almost entirely of ministers. Dartmouth was founded as a mission to convert the Indians. Reading was taught almost exclusively by the Protestant churches in order to enable children to read the Bible.¹⁷ Nevertheless, by the same process which affected Germany and by the same social fallacies, religious and moral education in America have now been undermined.

One of the conspicuous results, in addition to race and class conflict, is the great increase in divorce and the high prevalence of crime, especially juvenile delinquency.¹⁸ Year after year the nation-wide records have been showing an amazingly high rate of crime, especially among those below the age of twenty-one.¹⁹ This is going on in spite of the almost miraculous rise in years of education and physical standards of living affecting every level of the population. If our analysis of the progressive disintegration of moral authority and education is correct, the increase in crime will naturally be greatest among the youngest. This is just what the statistics on crime reveal.

Why should there be this actual as well as threatened increase in crime, in racial and industrial conflicts, at this advanced stage of American democracy? Why has the status of the Negro lagged so far behind the equality expressed by the American Creed? Because the American Creed has lost much of its authority and power. Why is the prejudice against the Jews at so dangerous a stage? Because both Jews and Gentiles have so nearly abandoned the moral laws on which this country was founded. Why does disunity between groups of all kinds threaten the very existence of our democracy? Because, as a people, we have increasingly discarded the great moral values which constitute our heritage from the past.

“Liberal” Variants of Religion and Morals

Quite obviously, the missionary zeal of many leading liberals, not only in behalf of racial minorities but in be-

half of social reform generally, represents an idealistic holdover from their religious forebears. It is remarkable to find how many prominent liberals are the sons or daughters of clergymen, or stem from parents or grandparents who were devoutly religious. Even though these liberals, many of them, have become "emancipated" from the dogmas of religion, they have nevertheless inherited some of the effects, notably the desire to help one's fellow men.

Many seem to have inherited this ideal in an exaggerated form, as though in compensation for the loss of the religious doctrines which first inspired it. Moreover, the liberal who has been so emancipated is free to do even more for others than the strictly religious person, because his range of action is less hampered by specific religious precepts. He can, for instance, give privileges to a racial minority regardless of the cost to the majority. He can redistribute the wealth of a nation with little concern for the methods used.

One manifestation of this is the extent to which many liberals have adopted the Marxian concept of the *classless* society, and with it the essential methods of Communism. Christianity, without doubt, is the religion of the common man rather than of the aristocrat, of the lowly rather than of the rich, of the social outcast rather than of the lordly. But Communism, these liberals claim, is the practical application of Christianity. It puts into effect what Christ really taught. It is the great leveller of caste and wealth. It seeks to achieve the kingdom of heaven here on earth. It is the true Social Gospel.

As evidence, they point out that Soviet Russia has done away with race discrimination. In a recent forum of the Town Meeting of the Air, on the subject of race prejudice,²⁰ the Negro speaker pointed repeatedly to the example of Soviet Russia and the extent to which all races there now enjoyed economic, political and social equality. He did not point out that the existing government of Soviet Russia differs from the American Creed about as completely as night does from day, or as a dictatorship does from a free people, or as a totalitarian state from a democracy. *In Russia, all people are the subjects of an absolute government.* There is no freedom of speech, no free press, no free assembly, no freedom in education, no freedom of jobs, as we know these freedoms. All are subject to a dictatorship which permits no criticism of the government, no opposing political parties, and consequently no free voting.

"Among other things," says Brooks Atkinson in his informed articles on Russia after his return as Moscow correspondent for the *New York Times* for ten months, "they (the Russian Communists) agreed to the vicious doctrine that the end justifies the means—which, incidentally, may be the reason why the first Socialist state in the world has not released the workers from slavery but has reduced them to totalitarian slavery that includes the mind as well as the body."

In our country, some Negroes and whites cannot vote unless they pay a poll tax. In Russia all the people, regardless of race, cannot vote in the true sense of democratic voting because they can vote only for the party in

power. In *classless* Russia, about 6,000,000 out of 180,000-000 Russians constitute the proletariat or the ruling class, and the condition of membership in this class is absolute submission to the dictatorship.

This is not the concept of equality or the dignity of man expressed by the American ideal. In the United States there is still racial injustice, but at least all men have certain basic liberties, and their freedoms are assured by a Constitution above the whims or edicts of any dictator. Nevertheless, certain liberals, inspired by Communism, are eager to sacrifice the essentials of Americanism for racial equality according to the Russian model. Moreover, these liberals are in the main stream of world trends. This stream, usually referred to as *The Revolution*, has been described here as the disintegration of Judaeo-Christian morals.

Liberalism as a Means to Political Power

The admirable idealism of much liberalism, whatever its origin, is accompanied in some instances by another, less admirable motive, the desire for political power. Vocal and dramatic action in behalf of racial minorities has been an effective means of winning votes. In a country having universal franchise, the highest idealism is bound to become mixed with considerations of political expediency. In political campaigns, for instance, the candidates who protest most loudly against racial discrimination are often the very ones doing most to inflame racial hatreds.

When, as may happen, the promises of liberals to racial

minorities create strong resentment among the majority, then we shall have a true test of this idealism. When it becomes more popular to condemn racial minorities than to fight for them, then only shall we see how firmly the belief in racial equality is fixed among a new generation of liberals.

If our diagnosis is correct, the derived idealism of the coming generations will be considerably more vague, and therefore weaker, than that of the present generation. The emphasis in education, for some time to come, will continue overwhelmingly on scientific truth at the expense of religious and ethical truths. The secular ideals of social reform, racial equality, the common man, the good of humanity, will become increasingly diluted and distorted by *realistic* considerations of economic and personal expediency. The consequences will be an increase in race and class conflict.

4. WHAT IS CLASS CONFLICT?

“WHICH is the more serious in the United States and the more dangerous to her future, *race hatreds*—that is, the hatred toward groups like the Negroes and the Jews, or *class hatreds*—that is, the hatreds between labor unions and employers, between capitalists and communists, between the common man and the wealthy man?” When this question was put to people throughout the nation⁴

- 34% said race hatreds were more dangerous.
- 24% said class hatreds were more dangerous.
- 25% said both were equally dangerous.
- 7% said neither was dangerous.
- 10% said they were uncertain.

And yet, at the time of this survey and the time of this writing, class hatreds and industrial conflict were far more serious and threatening than race conflict.

Potentially, race conflict may be the more dangerous but actually and objectively, class warfare is by far the more serious. Race hatreds in this country, as Dr. Odum,²¹ our own study,⁴ Lee and Humphrey in *Race Riot*,⁹ and many others have shown, are almost wholly unorganized and spontaneous. There is no consistent ideology behind them. Class warfare, however, does have an ideology around which, especially during recent years, class antagonisms have been organized on a tremendous nation-

wide scale. The differences between capitalists and labor, as described by this ideology, have been crystallized through employers' associations and through labor unions with membership of many millions. The very word, *Labor* has become the emotional symbol of organized class consciousness. This class consciousness has been further crystallized and codified by an elaborate collection of labor laws, bureaus and legal decisions.

The net result has been a decade of strikes and industrial conflict unprecedented in the nation's history. Even during the critical war years, strikes and slowdowns remained at phenomenally high levels. Hardly a day passed without from one to a dozen strikes involving from a few hundred to many thousands of people. In 1935 there were 2,003 recorded strikes.²² In 1945, a year after the Connally anti-strike law went into effect, there were 4,600 strikes with the highest record of man-day idleness since records of this factor have been kept. The year 1946 promises to top all previous records for industrial strife.

The race riots in Detroit, Los Angeles and elsewhere became front-page news not only because of their seriousness but because of their rarity. Industrial strife had become a daily diet. Personal violence and the destruction of property through strikes and picketing had become so common as to dull the public's powers of indignation. The race riots, especially that in Detroit where thirty-five people were killed and a thousand injured,⁹ were dramatic news which distracted attention even further from the highly organized class struggle.

Reduced to its lowest terms, class warfare is the strug-

gle between the "haves" and the "have-nots," the upper dog and the under dog, those who have property and those who do not. Basically it is not a struggle between classes at all, but one between individuals. It is the struggle between the private and his corporal, between the sergeant and his captain, between the employee and his employer, between the political boss and his henchmen, the bureau head and his subordinates.

Within the limits of fair play and morality, this struggle is the legitimate expression of the individual's desire to improve his lot. Prompted, however, by the passions of greed and jealousy, envy, covetousness and lust, this struggle degenerates into something quite different. The wealthy then try to enrich themselves even if they have to steal from the relatively poor, and the "have-nots" even if they must steal from the rich.

Class Warfare Depends on an Ideology

When such excesses, including often assault and murder, are committed by individuals, they are dealt with as crime. When the passions which lead to such crimes are rationalized and organized through an explicit ideology, as in Germany, then personal rivalries are raised (or lowered) to the level of class or race conflict.

Psychologically, the mechanics of creating class hatreds is precisely like that of creating race hatreds. The "haves" are made the target, the scapegoat, for the "have-nots." Just as Hitler made the Jews the scapegoat for the misfortunes and resentments of the German nation, so, in

class warfare, the successful and fortunate are made the scapegoat for the less successful.

Karl Marx and the Scapegoat Technique

Indeed, the Hitlerian technique of race persecution stems directly from a much older German ideology, the ideology of class warfare as developed by Karl Marx. *What Hitler's Mein Kampf is to racial conflict, the writings of Marx have for a hundred years been to class conflict.* In Marxian Communism the capitalists are made the scapegoat for the wage earners. The owners of industry are described as exploiting the wage earners, and thus growing richer and richer, while the "wage slaves" grow poorer and poorer. Therefore, the workers are urged to seize all land and industry by force and to make them the communal possession. This, they are told, is the basic solution of their economic troubles!

Thus taught this German propagandist for whom Hitler showed such contempt, but whose methods of arousing the baser passions of men he copied so effectively. In 1848, in the Communist Manifesto, Karl Marx formulated the technique of class conflict as follows:

The history of all human society, past and present, has been the history of class struggles.

Our own age, the bourgeois age, is distinguished by this—that it has simplified class antagonisms. More and more, society is splitting into two great hostile camps, into two great and directly contraposed classes: bourgeoisie and proletariat.

The proletariat, the lowest stratum of extant society, cannot raise itself, cannot stand erect upon its feet, without disrupting the whole super-structure composing the strata which make up that society.

The Communists everywhere support every revolutionary movement against extant social and political conditions.

In all these movements, the Communists bring the property question to the fore, regarding it as fundamental.

Communists scorn to hide their views and aims. They openly declare that their purposes can only be achieved by the forcible overthrow of the whole extant social order. Let the ruling classes tremble at the prospect of a Communist revolution. Proletarians have nothing to lose but their chains. They have a world to win.

Proletarians of all lands, unite!

Many people have called Communism a religion because of the fervor of its followers and because its great aim was to establish a new order, the order of a classless society. Some have even called it *applied Christianity* because the sympathies of Jesus lay with the multitudes and the poor rather than with the preferred and the rich. However, the dominant emotion in Christianity is *love* while in Communism it is *hate*.

"We must hate," said Lenin, *saint* of the Russian Revolution. "Hatred is the basis of Communism."

"Thou shalt love the Lord thy God . . . and thy neighbor as thyself. On these two commandments hang all the law and the prophets," said Jesus, choosing from the many commandments of the Old Testament those he considered greatest.

All the world's great religions place chief emphasis on the spiritual, whereas the chief emphasis of Communism is materialistic. The classless society, the brotherhood of man, is to be achieved by the simple, if drastic, step of destroying the ownership class and transferring their property to the "dictatorship of the proletariat" or the State. This is to be done by revolution, by the superior force of the masses. In short, the religious morals of the Judaeo-Christian concept of brotherhood were exactly reversed, in this manner:

Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself, but only after depriving him of his property.

Thou *shalt* steal, because, in order to bring about the classless society, it is essential that all land and means of production be turned over to the proletariat.

Thou *shalt* kill if the resistance of the owners of property makes it necessary.

Thou *shalt* covet thy neighbor's wealth, because, as a matter of fact, it is not his wealth at all. He has accumulated it only by exploiting the poor wage slaves.

Thou shalt *not* love thy God with all thy might, because "man is the highest being for man." "Man is the world of men, the State, society." "Religion is the sign of the oppressed creature, the feelings of a heartless world, just as it is the spirit of unspiritual conditions. It is the opium of the people." (Quotations from the *Deutsch-Französische Jahrbücher*, by Marx, 1844.)

Obviously, in order to make possible a revolution by force, with the destruction of the propertied class and the rights to private property, it was necessary first to destroy the authority of religion and religious morals. The State,

the proletariat, said Marx, cannot be emancipated as long as it is Christian, any more than the Jew can be emancipated as long as he is a Jew. "Upon what title do you Jews ground your claim for emancipation?" asked Marx, who was himself a Jew. "On your religion? It is the mortal foe of the State religion."

Liberalism and the Communistic Technique

Thus we find in Marx the perfect primer for Hitler's persecution of the church and the Jews. Hitler had only to substitute for the property owners, who were the scapegoat of Communism, the Jews. In this emulation of Marx, Hitler is not unique. Many professing liberals, who would vigorously deny being Communists or Fascists, have adopted the same techniques. One of their slogans is the high-sounding epigram: *Human rights are more important than property rights*. This is exactly the slogan by which Hitler deprived the Jews of their property. The human rights of the German working class, said Hitler, were more important than the property rights of the Jews. The Jews, he insisted, had obtained their wealth in the first place by exploiting the German working class. Therefore the German workers were only taking back what rightfully belonged to them.

So spoke some of America's leading liberals at the time of the great sit-down strike in Detroit. The factories and machines, they claimed, had really been created by the labor of the workers and, therefore, belonged to them as well as to the stockholders. Because their human rights to

higher wages had not been recognized by the technical owners, they had a right to take over the plants by force. It remained for one lonely judge in Detroit, in the confusion of class struggle, to repeat the protest which may still resound in the history of class conflict: "One wrong does not justify another." In a belated verdict the Supreme Court ruled the sit-down strikes as illegal, though this did not change the general trend of its decisions which have increasingly approved violence and organized attacks on property owners.

No fair-minded person would deny that the ownership of property must be regulated for the good of society. That is one of the functions of government and the law. However, the slogan that human rights are more important than property rights, as used by the demagogues of our time, is the dynamite of continuous class warfare. It says, with subtle deceptiveness, that the human rights of those who have acquired property, no matter how honestly, are less important than the human rights of those who have not; that the human rights of the factory or store owner are less to be considered than those of his employees; that the human rights of a house owner or a landlord are not in the same class with the human rights of a tenant. In short, the more destitute a man is, no matter what his faults, the more human he is; and the more prosperous a man is, no matter what his merits, the more inhuman he is. *This is the complete reversal of all morals and civilization.*

Compared with those who preach Communism in the name of liberalism, the doctrines of Marx are honest and

unambiguous. He definitely proposed the complete abolition of private property rights in one convulsive revolution, in the firm belief that, once all property belonged to the State, the inequalities between people would disappear. The fact that this belief was psychologically unsound, as even Soviet Russia now realizes, does not alter the sincerity or clarity of his proposal. "Communists scorn to hide their views or aims," said Marx. "The Communists bring the property question to the fore, regarding it as fundamental."

The advocates of human rights versus property rights in America have no such explicit and definite program. At any rate, they do not acknowledge such a program. Nevertheless, their methods are calculated to reach the same end but, as they put it, "within the democratic framework." Instead of destroying a property minority by violence they would destroy it by majority vote. Their slogan, *human rights versus property rights*, is a devious one calculated, consciously or not, to fan the hatreds between classes. Thus the majority can be induced to vote for laws and to support legal decisions which will in effect confiscate and socialize private property.

What the majority votes, according to such liberals, is right even though it wipes out an important minority. Thus the barbaric doctrine that might makes right is being applied within the democratic framework of the popular vote. This method is sometimes referred to as *the peaceful revolution*. Its technique and accomplishments are brilliantly described in a pamphlet, *The Revolution Was*,²³ by Garett Garrett.

To Americans, the technique of using a minority as the scapegoat or whipping boy for the majority is not a novelty. We have seen it used by the nation's highest officials with increasing ruthlessness. When the great depression of 1929 was prolonged well beyond the Republican regime, and a new explanation became politically expedient, this technique was resorted to. The "overprivileged" were made the scapegoat for the "underprivileged," the "haves" for the "have-nots," the "economic royalists" for the "forgotten man," the "greedy" for the "needy."

This technique was so effective as a means to power by the democratic process, or, to put it baldly, as a means of getting votes, that it has been continued ever since. Business owners and managers, as a class, have been made the object of consistent and indiscriminate denunciation. This scapegoat minority has been condemned as Tories, "Money Changers in the Temple," plutocrats, "Princes of Privilege," monopolists, soulless capitalists, barons of Wall Street, Bourbons of Business, exploiters of Labor, and profiteers. Just as there were no good Jews among the Jews in Germany, so there are no good capitalists among the capitalists in America.

By such popular appeals, class conflict has been raised to a pitch never before equalled in the United States. The harm done the scapegoat minority, great as it is, is small compared with the destructive hatreds aroused among the majority. These hatreds have expressed themselves not only in the widespread organization of labor, but in many other powerful pressure groups. Among labor unions, the bitterly antagonistic C.I.O., A.F.L., and in-

dependent groups have developed. The farmers as a class have become aroused against industrial labor. And now the veterans of World War II promise to give us another pressure group, one whose bitterness, according to a leading sociologist, is likely to shape conditions in the nation for twenty years. We are witnessing on a large scale the psychological truth that the emotions of class consciousness cannot be aroused with impunity; that by provoking hatred toward a special group, the emotions released are likely to spread to other groups.

Already the class antagonisms of this generation have changed the political and economic face of the nation. The Democratic and Republican parties until recently included all classes. Now they have become largely the parties of the Left and the Right, the lower income groups versus the higher income groups. All the polls of public opinion have demonstrated this trend. The labor unions, especially the C.I.O., have aligned themselves with the party of the left. Out of the labor unions has come the American Labor Party. This, in turn, has been split into two parties, one accusing the other of being Communistic. The Communists, whose basic mission is the abolition of private property and private business, are again an official party even though their energies are centered in the labor unions and the political labor groups.

Above all, the class hatreds of our time have been incorporated in a body of laws and legal decisions which make the continued growth of class conflict inevitable. For example, in 1932, the Norris-LaGuardia Act forbade the issuance of injunctions against labor unions by Fed-

eral courts. Since then organized picketing has increasingly become an instrument of mob violence and mob coercion. Not only the employer, but the individual employee is all but helpless against such mob action. The small shopkeeper as well as the department store proprietor, the man in his own home as well as the management of an enormous factory, are threatened and coerced and often harmed by such mass tactics. Picketing has become a powerful club in coercing helpless minorities.

The Wagner Act of 1935, administered by the National Labor Relations Board, has been described even by many unquestioned liberals as a one-sided law to encourage labor unions at the expense of owners and managers. It requires the N.L.R.B. to confine its investigations to unfair labor practices of employers and denies it the power to regulate the unfair practices of labor unions. In ten years this law and its administration has probably done more to spread and intensify class hatreds in America than any other influence in our history. So obvious has this fact become that a group of United States Senators, after long study, have proposed a complete revision of this law, one designed to bring a "rule of law and order instead of the rule of fists and force." However, the damage has been done. The hatreds have been systematized, rationalized and legalized.

The Supreme Court Condones Class Conflict

The Supreme Court of the United States has not only condoned but given an alarmingly broad scope to violence

and picketing when conducted by labor unions. In an editorial entitled "Permitted Violence," the *New York Times* on January 22, 1944, condemned a decision of the Supreme Court in these words: "In that decision the Court carried still farther the doctrine of a special legal license for unions to commit violence which it laid down in the case of the teamsters' union in March, 1942."

In that case, members of the teamsters' union lay in wait for trucks passing from New Jersey to New York and, by beating the drivers, procured payments ostensibly for driving the trucks into New York in place of the regular drivers who were already being paid for this job. The majority decision of the Supreme Court conceded the "use of violence" by union men, but nevertheless ruled that these men were free from prosecution under the Anti-Racketeering Act which Congress had passed to stop such practices. Chief Justice Stone, in his dissenting opinion, wrote that there was "abundant evidence that the payments were made to purchase immunity from violence and for no other reason." Furthermore, when the Anti-Racketeering Act was under consideration by Congress, "no member of Congress and no labor leader had the temerity to suggest that such payments, made only to secure immunity from violence and intentionally compelled by assault and battery, could be regarded as the payment of wages or that the compulsion is a legitimate objective of a labor union."

The *Times* editorial condemned even more severely the decision by the Supreme Court in January, 1944, permit-

ting violence in the case of the Toledo, Peoria and Western Railroad. A strike had been called by the union, but the railroad undertook to continue operations. The union established picket lines. As a result, clashes occurred between striking employees and those remaining at work. Quoting from the Court's unanimous decision: "Various incidents involving violence or threats of violence took place. Some resulted in personal attacks, others in damage to property and interruption of service." Nevertheless, by unanimous decision, the Supreme Court refused to grant relief to the railroad from such attacks. Commenting on this decision the *Times* concluded: "The punishment of the railroads for not accepting 'voluntary' arbitration under the Railway Labor Act is that the strikers will be free to use officially licensed violence and officially sanctioned sabotage."

In keeping with the above decisions the Supreme Court ruled in November, 1943, that union pickets could make untrue and damaging statements about a businessman *even though he is not an employer*. According to the unanimous decision of the Court in *Cafeteria Employees Union, Local 302, vs. Gus Angelos et al.*, a labor union picketed a cafeteria in an attempt to organize it. The cafeteria was owned by the respondents who themselves conducted the business without the aid of any employees. The pickets, one at a time, carried signs accusing the cafeteria of being unfair to organized labor, and told prospective customers that it served bad food and that by patronizing it they were aiding the cause of Fascism.

The Courts of New York State gave judgment in favor of the owners of this cafeteria, but the Supreme Court of the United States reversed their decision in the name of freedom of speech. However, the moral tragedy of this decision is found in the following words of the Court: "To use loose language or unrefined slogans that are part of the conventional give-and-take in our economic and political controversies—like 'unfair' or 'Fascist'—is not to falsify the facts."

In June, 1945, the Supreme Court ruled, in a five to four opinion, that a labor union may not be sued under the anti-trust laws for actions which resulted in the destruction of an employer's business. One of the partners of the Hunt's trucking business had been tried and acquitted in the killing of a union member during a strike. Thereafter the union refused to admit the Hunt employees to union membership. This was equivalent to destroying the business since only union truckers were allowed to handle goods at the warehouses.

In his dissenting opinion, Justice Jackson said that the Supreme Court by its decision permits to unions "the same arbitrary dominance over the economic sphere that labor so long, so bitterly and so rightly asserted should belong to no man." Justice Roberts wrote: "They intended to drive Hunt out of business as interstate motor carriers, and they succeeded in so doing. . . . The conspiracy, therefore, was clearly within the denunciation of the Sherman Act. . . ."

The Supreme Court Rules Moral Law Illegal

In short, by these decisions and others consistent with them, the Supreme Court of the United States has virtually ruled:

Thou mayest bear false witness against thy neighbor.
Thou mayest steal.
Thou mayest commit violence.

Evidently it could not, or was unwilling to, find anything in the Constitution, the Bill of Rights, or its own precedents to support the most elementary moral laws affecting the dignity or rights of the individual when not a union member.

How can the schools teach children not to use offensive and slanderous terms like *kike*, *sheeny*, *nigger*, etc., when the Supreme Court *encourages* adults to call others *Fascists*, *unfair*, etc., regardless of the facts? How can violence and vandalism against racial groups and churches be discouraged when they are vindicated in the realm of class struggle by the highest legal authority in the land?

Class Hatreds Breed Race Hatreds

The more the phenomena of race and class conflict are studied, the clearer it becomes that their causes as well as their cures are basically the same. It is probably no accident that the country's worst race riot in years, the outbreak between Negroes and whites in June, 1943, occurred in Detroit. Detroit had become the center of the

most highly organized class warfare in the country. The nation's greatest sit-down strike had occurred there. *In respect to the increase of race conflict in the United States generally, the significant fact is that it was preceded by a decade of the greatest intensification of class warfare in our history.*

It is impossible to stir up class hatreds without also stirring up race hatreds. One is often made the excuse for the other and the techniques, of course, are the same. One of the most serious of all wartime strikes was that of the six thousand transportation workers in Philadelphia in August, 1944, which paralyzed the war industries in that metropolis for a week. The strike was ostensibly against the employment of Negroes as motormen, but the leaders of one union claimed that this racial issue was merely the pretext of a rival union trying to gain control. This is exactly the point. When morals have been destroyed and hatreds let loose, any minority whether it be Negroes, Jews, employers, professors, or politicians, is likely to become the ready pretext or scapegoat in the struggle for power.

If our analysis of class conflict and race hatreds in America is approximately correct, then the commandment, Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself, has become for us far more than an academic ideal. It has become a moral imperative, a matter of either, or! Unless employers exercise leadership in ending racial discrimination and segregation among their employees, they may find themselves increasingly deprived of all leadership. Already the class war has considerably weakened their

authority. Class war intensified by race conflict will greatly hasten the process.

Similarly, unless white employees learn to work amicably with Negroes and Gentiles with Jews, they will find increasing job chaos. All groups will be deprived of the organizing, "know-how" type of leadership which transforms a milling mob into an efficient team. Their mutual antipathies will become the dynamite by which their teamwork and leadership will be destroyed.

5. WHAT ARE THE FACTS ABOUT RACE DIFFERENCES?

ARE THE FACTS about race differences such as to provide a rational basis for race harmony? This highly controversial subject well illustrates our claim that facts, no matter how important, are not adequate without moral standards.

Whatever the facts, they must contend with existing prejudices. The problems of race have always been less rational than emotional, but today, in a golden age of science and reason, they seem more emotional than ever. *Alarming, explosive, ominous, terrifying, dynamite*, are among the terms applied by journalists and students recently. As one expressed it, with reference to the tensions between whites and Negroes: "Volcanic forces are thrusting ever more powerfully against a thin and wavering crust." The volcanic forces are the destructive passions which, according to our analysis in the preceding chapters, have been released by the disappearing crust of moral principles. The continuous undermining during the past century of the elementary morals of social harmony is now producing its inevitable consequences.

Among these moral laws is the commandment: *Thou shalt not bear false witness against thy neighbor*. What happens when this law is forgotten has been well described in the book, *Race and Rumors of Race*,²¹ by H. W.

Odum. In this book Dr. Odum reports the results of an extensive study of American whites and Negroes. He and a large group of investigators discovered and exposed two thousand rumors current in the South in 1942 and 1943. The study found the Negroes less responsible for these rumors than the whites, and the Negro leaders less to blame than the reckless demagogues among white leaders. But, regardless of the blame, there was so little understanding between whites and Negroes, or between the South and the rest of the country, that these rumors, instead of being laughed out of existence, were often believed. As a result, race tensions had become uglier by far than they were during the first World War. Dr. Odum reports forces at work which might precipitate upon the country a catastrophe of frightful proportions.

In short, the book describes a critical stage in the releasing of the emotions from the morals and ideals which previously controlled them. This is the stage which provides the fuel for power-greedy politicians, revolutionists, and dictators. As the initial step in dealing with this situation Dr. Odum asks: "Was it possible first to declare a moratorium on all emotional and violent reactions and tempers . . . on all acts of violence . . . on all demagoguery . . . on the calling of names?"

Can Facts Eliminate Race Prejudice?

That the moral controls so long and so systematically weakened should, in the face of danger, suddenly regain their power is more than unlikely. That facts, or reason

based on facts, should ever gain control of these emotions is also questioned by many. And yet, while the machinery for moral and religious education has been declining, that for scientific education has grown to unprecedented proportions. If the facts about race were known and properly organized, our great educational system could spread them in a short time. Even the most pessimistic cannot deny that facts have at least some effect on human behavior.

Sad to say, facts about things are much more influential than facts about people. In regard to the qualities of an automobile we are more coldly scientific than about the qualities of a human being. This is not merely because the physical sciences are more advanced than the social sciences, but because human contacts inevitably generate feelings and prejudices. In the field of racial relations emotional forces have gathered such momentum that even the facts which have been established can hardly get a hearing.

To be fair, the facts themselves are open to misinterpretation by those trying to make a case either for or against the equality of races. Therefore, it is not unnatural that a pamphlet so admirable in many respects as that entitled, *The Races of Mankind*,²⁴ prepared by two anthropologists, should create such a storm of conflicting condemnation and approval when it appeared. So bitter was the controversy over this booklet that it was criticized in Congress, was refused circulation in U.S.O. centers, and dropped from orientation courses by the United States Army. And yet the facts about race differences in this

booklet were in the main accurate. It was their selection and interpretation which were open to criticism and which invited the charge by a Congressional committee of containing "all the techniques—more or less subtly presented—of Communist propaganda."

Among other things the booklet had given only one set of test results, and these some psychologists consider not representative. Also, it had held up Russia as an example of how race prejudice had been "outlawed" by force and without waiting for the democratic process. Thus, many admirable presentations of the facts about race lose their effect because they seem to be the means of promoting an *ism* which is as bad as the *ism* they are intended to combat.

The facts in regard to race differences are principally of two kinds, biological and psychological, or physical and mental. Physically, all races are alike in the essentials, with one possible exception, and different only in the non-essentials. The essentials are the bones, the muscles, the organs and the nervous system. The non-essentials are the color of the skin, shape of the head and facial features, texture of the hair, shape and color of the eyes, and like details. Teeth may be slightly different, but all races have thirty-two teeth. Even the blood stream is the same, every race having all four types of blood. The blood of one race is interchangeable with the blood of all other races. Once removed from the individual no one can tell from what race it came. The one essential in which biology has not yet proved the equality of races, and it is the most critical of all, is the higher organization and func-

tioning of the nervous system. This is a psychological as well as a biological problem, and a most intricate one. Incidentally, *The Races of Mankind* failed to mention this fact.

The facts regarding psychological differences between races are based on tests or standard devices for measuring people's capacities and abilities. There are literally thousands of such tests for measuring intelligence, musical talents, artistic talents, personality and character traits, mechanical and scientific aptitudes and many other abilities. These tests have been given to millions of people of many races. I had written almost a book on these findings alone, but, upon second thought, decided that it was entirely too involved to inflict on intelligent readers. Instead, I shall give here only the briefest summary and interpretation of the experiments made by psychologists.

It has long been my belief that psychology tends to make the facts of human nature unnecessarily complex and obscure. A little more ordinary, straightforward thinking applied to psychology would make its findings much more understandable and useful. In respect to race differences this is exemplified by the experience of a mother with her twelve-year-old son who had been bringing home report cards with marks in the low eighties. When she admonished him for not getting higher marks he had replied: "The teacher isn't worrying about me so why should you? She says that, considering my I.Q., I am doing good work."

"If your teacher isn't worrying," replied this mother

who, it happened, had a master's degree in psychology, "then it is high time that I was." Thereupon she called on the teacher who tried to explain that, in view of her son's I.Q. of 88, he was doing about as well as could be expected.

"That is just what I was afraid of," insisted the mother. "If you do not expect more of him, no wonder he doesn't do better. In spite of his I.Q. I expect him to do better, much better. And what is more, I am going to see that he does."

And she did, and he did.

This incident goes to the heart of a controversy which psychologists have been waging with increasing technicalities and fervor since 1912, namely, does the I.Q. measure heredity or education? This controversy now has an important bearing on the question: Are racial differences inherent or acquired?

The mother was right, of course, and the teacher was wrong, both scientifically and practically. *A person's abilities and achievements, no matter what his heredity, depend largely on the ideals and stimuli which motivate him.* The same is true of a race or a nation. People are not like gold and silver. They cannot be weighed and measured at birth once and for all. They are more like plants, whose growth and fruitfulness depend on the soil and the climate, as well as the seed.

With this fact in mind, we can consider briefly the tests which show the largest and most consistent differences between racial and national groups. These are the

so-called intelligence tests or tests giving an Intelligence Quotient or I.Q. The results of a study of 5,504 children made in the public schools of Massachusetts in 1926 are still indicative. These native-born children were classified by the nationality of their parents, with the following results:²⁵

<i>Nationality</i>	<i>Average I.Q.</i>	<i>Nationality</i>	<i>Average I.Q.</i>
Polish Jews	102.8	British Canadians	93.8
Swedes	102.1	Russians	90.9
English	100.7	Poles	89.6
Russian Jews	99.5	Greeks	87.8
Germans	98.5	Italians	85.8
Americans	98.3	French Canadians	85.3
Lithuanians	97.4	Negroes	84.6
Irish	95.9	Portuguese	82.7

Many other studies have been made in more recent years, including one²⁶ in Wisconsin of 28,560 high-school children who had both parents of the same nationality. This study ranked nationalities according to their intelligence scores in the following order:

- | | |
|--------------|------------------------|
| 1. Jewish | 10. Bohemian |
| 2. Irish | 11. Greek |
| 3. Danish | 12. Russian and Slavic |
| 4. Hungarian | 13. Belgian |
| 5. Dutch | 14. Polish |
| 6. Scotch | 15. French |
| 7. American | 16. Negro |
| 8. Norwegian | 17. Syrian and Italian |
| 9. English | |

Seventy-eight such studies made during the past twenty-seven years have been combined by Klineberg,²⁷ a leading psychologist in this field. On the basis of Klineberg's results and the author's own estimates the standing of certain groups in the United States was approximately as follows:

	<i>Median</i> <i>I.Q.</i>		<i>Median</i> <i>I.Q.</i>
Swedish and		Chinese	97
Norwegian	103	Mexican	85
Jewish	102	Italian	85
English and Scotch	101	Negro	84
American	100	Portuguese	82
German and Irish	100	Indians (American)	78
Japanese	99		

Why Intelligence Scores Are Misleading

Some psychologists, the author²⁸ among them, have held that intelligence tests do not measure native intelligence at all. Rather, they measure a combination of capacity, incentives and education. In that case the above scores may not show real differences between races but differences in their educational opportunities, years of education, and incentives.

Widely publicized in support of this contention are the results of the Army Intelligence tests given to soldiers during World War I. The median scores on these tests show that the Negroes from certain Northern states had better scores than the *whites* from certain Southern states. For instance:

Median Scores on Army Alpha Intelligence Tests

<i>Southern Whites</i>		<i>Northern Negroes</i>	
Mississippi	40.8	New York	44.5
Kentucky	41.0	Illinois	46.9
Arkansas	41.0	Ohio	48.8

The higher scores of the Northern Negroes are attributed to the fact that they had had better educational opportunities than the whites of the Southern states. Such facts were given in the pamphlet, *The Races of Mankind*, to prove that if Negroes and whites had the same education the difference in their average intelligence scores would disappear. However, the problem is not that simple, as may be seen from the following table where the Negroes of these Northern states are compared with the whites from these same states:

Median Scores on Army Alpha Intelligence Tests

<i>Whites</i>		<i>Negroes</i>	
New York	64.0	New York	44.5
Illinois	63.0	Illinois	46.9
Ohio	66.7	Ohio	48.8

Therefore, in the same states, the Negroes scored considerably below the white soldiers. Indeed, they scored as far below white soldiers in these states as they scored below whites in the country as a whole. "One might argue, therefore," says Dr. Henry E. Garrett, head of the Department of Psychology at Columbia University, "that given better education the Negro does, indeed, improve

his Alpha score, but not his position relative to the white. And it might be argued further that since white southerners did about as well as northern Negroes, in spite of marked educational handicaps, had they had the same advantages as the northern Negro they would have exceeded the Negro medians on Alpha just as the northern whites did. After all, it must be remembered that education affects whites as well as Negroes.”²⁹

The one important factor which these results do not reveal is the influence of incentives. If the lack of incentives, relatively, was the same among Negroes in the North as in the South, this might well account for the comparative inferiority of Negroes regardless of states. In view of the greatly improved education for both whites and Negroes since the last war, the results of the intelligence tests given in World War II will be very significant.

Test Scores Depend Largely on Incentives

Many psychologists have maintained that the I.Q. was not a measure of the amount or quality of education but of the capacity to absorb education.²⁸ If this were true, then the differences between racial groups which these tests now show would have to be accepted as permanent. It would also mean that the teacher with the boy whose I.Q. was 88 was right and the mother who expected him to do better was wrong. However, psychological experiments have proved what common sense has always maintained, that people's abilities depend *not only on their*

capacities but also on their incentives. If children are not properly stimulated by their parents and others to do well in their studies, they will not do their best. And if parents do not value formal education highly, they will, naturally, not inspire their children to take advantage of their opportunities.

In the American Indians we see the tragic result of this condition. The Indians, not unnaturally, resented the culture of their conquerors. They wanted to preserve their own language and customs. They did not want their children to go to American schools and learn American ways. They either preferred or were forced to live on Indian reservations. They stand lowest in the intelligence tests because they preferred not to acquire the kind of intelligence represented by American schools. The extensive studies of the psychologist Garth⁸⁰ clearly reveal this fact. Possibly this was itself due to a lack of intelligence! However, we must give the benefit of any doubt to the Indians because, if ever a people was robbed, persecuted, massacred, and unjustly treated, it was the American Indian. They had good reason for despising the intelligence and culture of the white man. Only in recent years has this race shown its capacities to adopt the white man's culture.

The incentives for education are of two broad kinds, those which come from the future and those which come from the past. The Jews, for example, have both incentives to a high degree whereas the Negroes do not. To the Jews in this country all learned occupations are open. They have a future as teachers, doctors, lawyers, archi-

fects, engineers, and may practice among Gentiles as freely, or almost as freely, as among Jews. This is not true of Negroes. Their opportunities in the learned professions are not nearly so great as those of the Jews. Consequently, their incentives for formal education are not nearly so strong.

As an incentive from the past the Jews inherit one of the great cultures of all time. This culture, revolving about the Hebraic law and history, has been transmitted century after century through formal education. The Jews inherit from their past a high regard for culture and learning.

In spite of, or because of, their background, the Jews have been widely scorned. Whereas the Negroes have been treated as slaves or inferiors for three or four centuries, the Jews have been persecuted wherever they gained a foothold for well over two thousand years. However, instead of decaying, they learned to adapt themselves and to overcome obstacles.

It is natural that, under these circumstances and with such incentives, the Jews should develop extra aggressiveness and unusual abilities. Since education in America was a shibboleth of success, they sought it with unusual determination. Jewish parents, even those who had just emigrated to America, sent their children to school with an almost fierce resolve. They made unusual sacrifices and endured actual hardships to give them a higher education. Therefore, the Jewish youth should be expected to excel in the intelligence tests which are really measures of the quantity and quality of formal education.

The Negroes, after less than a century of freedom, have already produced outstanding men and women in science, music, the theater, religion, literature, politics, education, jurisprudence, and other fields. They have proved themselves amazingly adaptable to the American way of life. They are not only rapidly adopting the cultural heritage of America, but such figures as Booker T. Washington, George Washington Carver, Paul Robeson, Marion Anderson, Roland Hayes, Glenn Settle and Judge Rivers have contributed creatively to that culture. In the Negro spiritual and related ballads the Negro people have created a musical literature of a high order, one which not only uniquely expresses the experience of the Negro race but also the common religious heritage of most Americans. Because of its form and its content, this music has done much to endear the Negro race to the whites.

Culturally, the Negroes have acquired in a very short time a background of incentives which is leading them to make progressively better use of the educational facilities now available to them. Moreover, with the progress they have already made, it is only to be expected that they will become increasingly impatient with the restrictions and lack of incentives that impede their further progress.

Does this mean that if vocational as well as educational opportunities were equal for all races and classes, the intellectual differences between them would disappear? Since we have never had a polyglot society in which such equality existed we cannot answer this question with certainty. This we can say: Insofar as the American ideals of universal education and equal opportunity regardless

of race or class have become effective, the average intellectual differences between the various groups have become smaller. When the results of the intelligence tests given in this war are compared with those of the last war, the differences between racial groups, in my opinion, will be found to be significantly smaller.

We have so far dealt with the tests that have shown the largest and most consistent differences between races, the so-called intelligence tests and tests of academic education. But education and intellect as measured by these tests are only one criterion of superiority. There are many other abilities of equal or greater importance. It happens that in the United States we have adopted academic intelligence as our chief yardstick of excellence and have built around it the greatest system of free and compulsory education in the world's history, our grade schools and high schools. The basic subjects throughout these grades are reading, writing, and of course, conversation. These, consequently, are the principal elements in most intelligence tests. Among the three R's, arithmetic is a poor third.

But there are other standards of excellence at least as valid as academic education. Among them are character and personality, leadership, musical talent, talent in the arts and crafts, mechanical and scientific ability. *In all these fields psychological tests show no consistently substantial differences between races.*

In respect to musical talents, for instance, the Seashore tests in some studies have shown Negroes slightly superior to whites and in other studies have shown the reverse.

Music is not taught as universally or consistently as reading and writing. Moreover, these tests measure such basic talents as sense of pitch, rhythm, intensity, dissonance and melodic memory. These abilities, it has been established, are not much affected by musical training. *Therefore, in the musical field, we have a truer measure of innate capacities than we do in respect to intelligence.*

Tests of speed of reaction show no consistent difference between races. The quickness of response to visual, auditory, or other stimuli does not vary consistently. In other words, the elementary perceptual faculties, out of which more complicated abilities are developed, have not been found much different in various race groups. This agrees with the fact that in athletic sports, motoring, aviation and all pursuits requiring the highest degree of mental and physical coordination all races compete on an almost equal footing.

A good personality and character are just as important as a good mind. Personality and character include such traits as social ability, cooperativeness, emotional stability, leadership, self-reliance, honesty, good sportsmanship, industry. There are now many tests which measure such traits with varying degrees of validity. Among them is a test³⁰ which gives an S.Q., or Social Maturity Quotient, another¹ which gives a P.Q., or Personality Quotient. The I.Q., broadly speaking, measures what a person *knows* about people and things; the S.Q. and P.Q. measure what a person *does* about people and things. These tests have shown small or inconsistent differences between racial groups.

Moreover, and this is of major importance, the personality tests as a group have revealed no differences among whites paralleling their differences in intelligence or education! Whites with a high I.Q. or many years of education are just as likely to rank low in personality tests as are whites with a low I.Q. and very little education, and vice versa. Not only my own experiments,¹ but about seventy experiments³¹ by many other psychologists reveal this lack of agreement between the results of personality tests on the one hand and of intelligence tests or years of education on the other. To give but one example, sociologists as well as psychologists have shown that the higher the education, the lower the rate of marriage. Marriage has been proved one of the basic clues to personality.

These findings show that the habits of a good personality are not being taught in the schools as are the habits of a good mind. Indeed, we know from experience that personality and character traits are acquired largely from parents, companions, church or Sunday school, gainful work, and by accident rather than through formal education. Our educational system has not even formulated the habits of an effective personality and a good character. Hence, it cannot teach such habits as thoroughly as it does the three R's.

Therefore, those races or groups whose academic education is low do not suffer a corresponding disadvantage in respect to personality training. Equally, those whites or Negroes who have an unusual amount of formal education are not proportionately superior in character or per-

sonality. In short, the differences between races shown by psychological tests of personality and character traits are not consistent or significant.

We have, thus far, carefully refrained from concluding that all races are inherently equal in ability or capacity. We have pointed out that, insofar as standardized psychological tests are concerned, the only field in which there are appreciable and consistent differences is in the area of scholastic intelligence and academic education. Also that these differences tend to grow smaller as education and vocational opportunities become more equal.

A Conservative Interpretation of the Evidence

Now let us assume that there are inherent racial or group differences which no amount of education or opportunity can fully eradicate. Let us assume, for the sake of argument, that the Negroes, Indians, Mexicans and Portuguese are inferior and that the Scandinavian, Jewish, English and Americans are innately superior. Let us estimate these differences to the best of our ability on the basis of the test evidence available. Let us base this estimate not only on the intelligence tests, but on the tests of character and personality, artistic and musical talents, mechanical and scientific abilities and other traits.

An actual average of these test results even if possible would be unscientific. However, a scientific *guess* is permissible, especially in view of the point we are about to make. My estimated average for all tests, on a scale in which scores range from 0 to 200, is as follows:

Scand.	Jew.	Eng.	Amer.	Mex.	Negro	Port.	Ind.
102	101	101	100	95	94	93	92

According to this estimate, the average for the highest group is 102 and for the lowest 92, so that the averages for all races are 10 points *or less* apart. On a scale of 200 this means a difference of 5 per cent between the lowest and the highest average. This is a little less than half the differences in the averages of I.Q. scores alone, as already shown. Since the non-intelligence tests show no consistent differences our estimate of the racial differences on all tests combined is conservative. What are the practical implications?

A difference of only 5 per cent between the average of the highest and the lowest race, if innate and permanent, is large enough to be important.

However, *the average differences between races do not apply to the individuals who make up each race*. For example, because the average for the Indians is 5 per cent lower than the average for the Scandinavians, it does not follow that every Indian is 5 per cent lower than every Scandinavian. In fact, 31 per cent of all Indians are equal or superior to 50 per cent of the Scandinavians.

Though the average for the American whites is 100, about half of them would be above 100, the other half below. Therefore, if we think of individuals rather than of averages, some American whites are superior and others are relatively inferior. For every superior American there is an inferior American.

Similarly, for every superior Scandinavian, Jew or

Englishman there is one of the same race who is inferior. Moreover, the superior members of these races can almost be matched with the superior Americans, in proportion to their total population, of course.

Negroes, Mexicans, and Indians also divide into those who are superior and those who are inferior. On the basis of our scale of 200, the percentage of superior Negroes and Indians is almost as high as the percentage of superior whites. The percentage of those inferior is only slightly larger than the percentage of inferior whites.

In short, it is impossible to say, just because a person is black or white, red or yellow, that he is inferior or superior. The chances are not far from even that, picking any Indian at random, he will be as superior, or as inferior, as the first white man picked at random, if not actually, at least potentially.

The real differences, the great differences, are between individuals, not between races.

This fact is so simple and yet so difficult to grasp. It was only a few years ago that women were regarded as the intellectual inferiors of men. And yet, on all available tests it has been found that women are equal or only slightly below or above the average of men. But in establishing this, it was also discovered that the real differences were not between men and women, but between superior men and inferior men, between superior women and inferior women. For every superior man there is an equally superior woman, and for every inferior woman there is an equally inferior man.

The consideration of individuals as individuals, on their personal merits, regardless of class, race or sex, is one of the most difficult of all mental habits to acquire. For the sake of peace and progress it is also one of the most important of all habits to acquire. Without becoming involved in the scientific details, this habit could be, and should be, taught in all elementary schools.

Probably the most important discovery from psychological testing is that academic intelligence and personality do not go hand in hand.¹ The person with many years of education is just as likely to be socially and emotionally immature as the person with very little schooling, and vice versa.

Aside from the evidences of psychology are the statistics on the increase of crime, of gambling, of divorce, of alcoholism, of juvenile delinquency, of mob action. These increases have accompanied the greatest increase and spread of education in history. If the schools had taught the habits of personality and character as thoroughly as the habits of memorizing and thinking, the problems of race and class conflict would not be so acute today. These habits are just as susceptible to teaching as are the habits of reading and spelling. The habits of personality and character are multitudinous, but their common denominator is a respect for and an ability to work with others.

Therefore, whatever the facts about racial differences, the important task of the schools is to teach pupils to regard each other as individuals. But to do this on a merely intellectual or academic level is not enough. It

must be done on a level of action and cooperation. It must be done in terms of the social habits that make for character and personality. In short, it must be done on a moral level. This calls for a radical revision in our present educational system which I have tried to suggest in the later chapters on education.

6. EQUALITY AND THE COMMON MAN

ARE MEN REALLY EQUAL?

According to psychological findings they are not. Indeed, psychology may be defined as the science of human inequalities. Scientific psychology rests on the use of tests or standardized yardsticks of ability. There are now several thousands of tests measuring many aptitudes and abilities. No matter which test is given, individuals are found to be unequal. Their inequalities vary from very slight to very great, from imbecility to genius.

These differences are not necessarily due to unequal opportunities. In the same family, for instance, one child may be a Phi Beta Kappa student while another child may not even be able to get into college. One may be popular, another unpopular. One may be a successful business or professional man, another may not even be able to hold a job. One may marry happily, another may not marry at all. And yet each of them may have had equal advantages and opportunities.

No matter how equal their advantages, individuals develop unequally. Equal opportunities do not bring equal results.

Furthermore, no matter how high the standard of living, individuals still develop unequally. For example, the growing prosperity of a couple may enable them to give greater advantages to their last child than to their first.

Still the child upon whom the family has lavished all the educational opportunities which money can buy may be far surpassed by an older brother who had to learn the hard way. In two families, one rich and one poor, the rich children may begin well and end as failures, whereas the poor children may begin at a seeming disadvantage and achieve success.

The ultimate differences between individuals have little relation to the social or economic status in which they are born. The eminent English psychologist, William McDougall,³² once described experiments which he interpreted as proving that the children of the aristocrats and the wealthy are more intelligent than those of "good plain citizens." Many experiments since then have proved quite clearly that this is not true. Given equal educational opportunities, the children of "ordinary citizens" do just as well *or just as poorly* as the children of more favored families. *Even without equal opportunities the children of the lower income groups tend to be just as successful or unsuccessful in school as the children of the higher income groups.*³³

There are two apparently contradictory trends in education. One is to give all children equal opportunities, the other is to give exceptional opportunities to the gifted. For instance, special classes for the naturally bright children are often provided so that they will not be retarded by the naturally dull. Psychologists have conducted elaborate experiments with so-called "genius children," children with an Intelligence Quotient of about 1.80. Over a period of years selected groups of such children have been given

special education in the hope that they would develop into great intellects. The results have been very disappointing. It seems that such children do not carry out their early promise in later life just because they are given unusual opportunities.

In short, no matter how people are treated, whether equally or unequally, whether on a high or a low level of living, they respond as individuals. Somehow they develop different kinds and degrees of ability and character *no matter what the circumstances*. Nothing can be more important than a favorable environment. But, no matter how favorable the environment, individuals develop wide differences.

Therefore, if all races were of equal ability, on the average, and had absolutely equal opportunities, the race problem would be far from solved. This is because the important differences are within races, not between races. There would still be lazy whites and ambitious whites, shiftless Negroes and industrious Negroes, well-to-do Negroes and those in poverty, successful Jews and Jews who are failures.

Furthermore, if the Marxian ideal of a *classless* society could be realized, and every human being started on an absolutely equal basis, the economic struggle would still be far from a solution. The differences between Cain and Abel, between Jacob and Esau, between Joseph and his brethren, between David and Uriah, between Peter and Judas Iscariot, would still remain. These differences are the basic causes of social conflict *and social progress* at any level of society, in any age, and under any political

system. The elimination of capitalism or the profit system does not eliminate the profit motive, as Communist Russia has well demonstrated. Indeed, it may release it in a far more ruthless form.

Paradox of Scientific vs. Moral Equality

If the inequality of individuals is so obviously the true order of nature, what becomes of the claim that all men are essentially equal? Is Thomas Jefferson's famous phrase that "all men are created equal," a political fiction rather than a self-evident truth?

According to scientific and factual standards, the statement that all men are created equal is false. According to religious and moral standards it is true. This seeming contradiction illustrates the great possible difference between scientific truth and moral truth. Unless this real difference is clearly understood, the entire problem of equality is bound to remain in the very confusion that exists today.

The doctrine of equality and the common man is many centuries older than the scientific proofs of his inequalities. It stems directly from the belief in the soul and its immortality. According to many religions, every person, no matter what his race or station, is endowed with a soul. The worth of a man's soul is held to be far above the worth or worthlessness of his earthly existence. What shall it profit a man if he gain the whole world and lose his own soul? According to the Christian religion, the soul is man's connecting link with God. It makes all men the sons of

God and in this sense equal. The soul knows no distinction of color, caste or wealth. No one can take these with him.

The modern doctrines of *the dignity of man* and the worth of *the common man* rest squarely on this old-fashioned foundation. Unfortunately, organized religion, instead of reinterpreting its old-fashioned truths in modern terms, has largely surrendered them to the onslaughts of science and the social studies. For instance, the doctrine of the soul and immortality, so frowned on by science, is really a dramatic expression of the supreme value of every individual. In political terms, it means that the soul, not the social or the economic system, lives on. The individual, not the state, has ultimate value. Therefore, the state exists for the individual as in a democracy, and not the individual for the state, as in Fascism and Communism.

Nowhere is this old-fashioned truth more evident than in the doctrine of natural rights as embodied in the Declaration of Independence and in the early history of America. "We hold these truths to be self-evident:" wrote Thomas Jefferson, "that all men are created equal: that they are endowed by their creator with certain natural and inalienable rights." These rights and freedoms, then enumerated and amplified in the Bill of Rights, are defined as more important than the government of King George, *more important than any particular government, including the new government of the United States, more important even than the descisions of a majority in this new Republic.* America has remained a Republic or a

limited democracy as long as she has just because these basic rights in which all men are equal have not been too much impaired by majority rule. The rights of minorities, until recently, have been held just as sacred as the rights of majorities.

In the face of growing scientific proof that individuals are unequal, religion teaches that their equality is more important than their differences. For instance, the I.Q. or Intelligence Quotient has been increasingly used to classify children as superior or inferior in intellectual capacity. Though of great educational value, this test has undoubtedly helped to foster intellectual class consciousness. It has given some individuals a damaging sense of inferiority, others a damaging sense of superiority.

The religious doctrine of equality says, in effect, that no single test or any collection of tests can measure the true nature of any person. The unique potentiality of the individual escapes all these mechanistic devices. Whether the test be in terms of wealth or poverty, scholastic achievement, votes received, they all fail to reveal the person's true worth. All individuals are equal in the sense that they possess powers beyond the scope of science to define or gauge.

Thus, the concept of equality is a rebuke to the pretensions of psychology, psychoanalysis, psychiatry and all those little theories that catalogue man in types or describe him as a collection of complexes, habits, drives, and other interchangeable parts. The concept of equality is a pronouncement of the limitless mystery and possibilities of the individual.

Faith in the Possibilities of the Individual

This does not mean that the concept of equality is a vague and mystical sort of truth. Quite the contrary, it represents facts just as hard and practical as any in the field of science. To give but a single example we call attention to the phenomenal success of Alcoholics Anonymous in helping chronic alcoholics to rehabilitate themselves. With a religious moral concept of the individual, Alcoholics Anonymous has succeeded where psychiatry, psychoanalysis, and other mechanistic methods have failed. Many scientists have testified to this success and many are making a study of the philosophy which made it possible.

The concept of equality is basically a religious faith in the possibilities of the individual. It is significant that the great exponents of equality and the common man, from Moses and Jesus to Jefferson and Lincoln, were men of transcending superiority. They were interested in the common man not because he was common but because he might be uncommon, not for what he was but for what he might become. Indeed, it seems to take an uncommonly superior man to believe fully in equality and the common man. Thomas Jefferson, the Great Commoner, is the perfect example.

Thus, while science emphasizes the facts of individual differences the doctrine of equality inspires and helps to create these differences. It does not state that all men must become equal; it states that *all men have equal rights to make the most of their inequalities.*

This dogma is the foundation of all morals and justice. It says, in effect, that every person is so equal in worth that no other person has the right to infringe on his possibilities. No man has a right to enrich himself at the expense of another. When it comes to stopping for a red traffic light, the man in a limousine is no better than the man in a jalopy. When it comes to bearing false witness, coveting and stealing, no one can be excused because he is richer or poorer than his neighbor. Morals are like the lanes in a swimming race or the rules in a football game. They are the guides which permit every individual to make the most of himself without injustice to his neighbors.

Justice, the blindfold woman with the scales, is the symbol of this equality. If a Negro and a white man stand in the scales with opposing claims, Justice cannot see their color and her scales must weigh by the impersonal standards of the law. If one claimant is poor and the other rich, Justice is still blind and must weigh the merits of the claims as though both men were equally rich or equally poor. In short, under the moral law, all men are equal, regardless of color, class, or creed.

Tragic Exception of the Negro

Therefore, laws and customs which condemn the Negro to an inferior status or which prevent him from making the most of his potentialities are definitely immoral. It is one of the strange anomalies of history that America, the first country to give large scope to the concept of equality, excepted an entire race from its provisions. By tacit con-

sent, the Negroes were not included under the phrase "All men are created equal." The early constitutions of several Southern states specified that "All *freemen* . . . are equal in rights," thus making the slaves an exception.

America has paid enormous penalties, including the Civil War, for her subordination of the Negroes. While great progress has been made in removing these restrictions, enough still remain to constitute a serious threat to social harmony. The greatest threat, in the author's opinion, arises from the extent to which race riots and crimes tend to obscure the far more serious dangers of economic and class warfare. The sooner the discrimination against Negroes is done away with, the clearer and more understandable will become the problem of class warfare.

The Modern Concept of Equality and the Common Man

The modern and popular concept of equality and the common man is quite different from the historic American concept or that described, for instance, by De Tocqueville in his two volumes, *Democracy in America*,³ and more recently by Henry Alonzo Myers in his brilliant little book, *Are Men Equal*.³⁴ According to this newer doctrine, people in the United States do not have equality because they are unequal economically. Its emphasis is not so much on equality of opportunity as on equality of results. It insists that the common man must improve his position by using his mass power to reform the economic system. This modern concept refers to the common man often by such terms as the "little man," the "little people," the

"average man," the "forgotten man." According to this concept, the common man is a sad fellow who is always being exploited by somebody. Through no fault of his own he is relatively underprivileged, downtrodden, inadequately nourished. He is the victim of a system of economic inequalities.

While the lot of the common man has been widely deplored his condition has never been objectively defined. Who, specifically, is this common man? In the United States, according to the available statistics, he is a man who, in nine cases out of ten, has one or more radios in working order. More often than not he sleeps between sheets and has access to an inside toilet and bathroom. If he is a farmer and has no inside toilet or bathroom, he is still likely to own his own automobile. If a city dweller, he usually reads a daily newspaper. He enjoys his daily quota of cigars or cigarettes and, quite often, beer or liquor. His children, in addition to their milk, have several "cokes" or soft drinks a day. His home or apartment, if a city dweller, is usually wired for electricity and, the chances are, contains an electric refrigerator or an icebox. His children, with few exceptions, will have all or at least part of a high-school education.

As compared with the common man in Europe, Russia, China and in fact most of the world, the common man of the United States is a bloated plutocrat. Never in the history of the world have the great masses of a nation achieved so high a level of economic equality and privilege. Why, then, the popular ideology in America of the "little man," the "little people," the "forgotten man"?

First of all, because the common man is defined not by what he has but by what the uncommon man has. In comparison with the management and entertainment class, the large property owners and the possessors of acquired or inherited capital, the average American still seems relatively poor and underprivileged. These inequalities, vividly dramatized by the movies and other popular media, are continuously stressed by the advocates of the common man in such a way as to stimulate his jealousies and hatreds. Political demagogues have discovered this to be the surest formula by which to exploit the emotions of the masses. Hence their persistent emphasis on the "haves" versus the "have-nots," the "greedy" versus the "needy," the scheming landlord versus the long-suffering tenant, and similar black and white contrasts.

The concept of the common man, increasingly since the time of Marx, has become an ideological device for the creation of class consciousness and class warfare. The fact that, according to public opinion polls, upwards of 85 per cent of all Americans consider themselves members of the middle class does not alter their susceptibility to this kind of psychological provocation. As De Tocqueville³⁵ expressed it, "the desire for equality always becomes more insatiable in proportion as equality becomes more complete."

The Ideology of the Scapegoat

However, the modern doctrine of the common man goes far beyond the play on his desires for equality. It ap-

peals to his most vulnerable weakness. It says to him: *The reason you have so little is not because you are less able but because your neighbor has so much. It is not your fault, it is the fault of the system. This system is run for the profit of the few rather than the use or good of the many. Your wages are not higher because the managers and millionaires take much of what really should be yours. There is just so much land to go around and if one man owns a thousand acres it means that a thousand common men, like you, are kept from having one acre each. There is just so much natural wealth in the country, and the few who got in ahead of you are keeping you from getting your share. You are the poor victim who has been exploited by the man who has more than his just share.*

This, with high-sounding variations, is the basic theme in the modern ideology of equality and the common man. We do not claim that this is the entire doctrine, but this is its common denominator. It is almost the exact opposite of the classical or religious concept of equality. Instead of appealing to man's strength it appeals to his weakness. Instead of urging him to improve his own talents it urges him to revolutionize the social system. Instead of praising the man who has achieved success, it condemns him as having prospered at the expense of the common man. The successful man is thus made the scapegoat for the less successful. The common man, instead of being inspired to make the most of himself, is encouraged to make the most of his scapegoat.

This ideology represents psychological suicide. It tends

to destroy the most original and creative forces within the individual.

In my work with hundreds of people and their problems, I found that some accepted responsibility for their troubles while others did not. The outlook for the former was usually hopeful, for the latter dismal. The latter had acquired the habit of *scapegoat thinking or feeling*. They had learned to blame their parents, or their employers, or conditions in childhood, or some peculiar complex, or the *system*—anyone but themselves—for their difficulties. Therefore, since they believed others responsible for their failure they also held others responsible for their success. They had surrendered the power to make the most of themselves. Psychologically, they had buried the one, five or ten talents with which they had been endowed.

The Defeatism of Modern Science

This suicidal tendency toward scapegoat thinking is not an accident and is not limited to the racial and economic fields. It is the basic element in the false ideologies which have come to dominate our time. As I have pointed out at length in *The Rediscovery of Man*, all the sciences have contributed to the belief that man is the victim of a mechanistic world and anything but the captain of his soul. Physics and chemistry have described the universe as a machine operating by immutable laws of cause and effect. Man is but a cog in this machine. Astronomy has revealed an infinite universe of wheels within wheels held together

by forces of gravity. In this great system man is an infinitesimal dot of little consequence. Geology and evolution portray him as little more than a monkey. Biology has described man as a physical organism whose behavior is determined by internal bits of machinery. Jacques Loeb, discovering certain of these mechanisms which he called tropisms, concluded that man—his fears, his hopes, his mistakes, his aspirations—is merely the interaction of myriad tropisms. Endocrinology, discovering certain glands, tells us an elaborate story of *the glands regulating personality*. Psychiatrists have repeatedly told us that types of personality, the cycloid, the epileptoid, the schizophrenic, are inherited and there is little the individual can do to change himself.

The I.Q., psychologists have taught, is hereditary and therefore individuals cannot do much to raise it. Phobias, drunkenness, hysterics and the common mental ailments, according to modern psychiatry, are not the results of a person's sins against himself and society; they are produced by the pressures and tensions of our times. According to Freud and psychoanalysis, people's difficulties are caused by complexes hidden in the subconscious mind over which they have no control. Every science and pseudo-science has contributed toward the fallacy that man is the helpless product of his environment, his parents, his social status, his economic condition, etc. Our everyday vocabulary has become one of intellectual superstitions and pseudo-scientific recipes for defeat.

With such a background it is not surprising that this degrading fallacy has reached its climax in the current

doctrine of equality and the common man. According to this doctrine, the common man is the unfortunate victim of an unjust economic system while the uncommon man is its undeserving beneficiary. Therefore the common man is urged, by the apostles of this creed, to pool his personal weakness through labor unions, labor and socialist parties, picketing and other forms of mass action. If he does this he can, by sheer weight of numbers, seize what he considers his just dues. He can, by the power of the ballot or by overwhelming physical force, quickly take from the present owners what he might not achieve through personal ability. He can, by crippling the uncommon man, especially the business class, lessen the existing economic equalities.

Thus, the modern doctrine of equality and the common man is essentially the defeatist ideology of the scapegoat. As the Nazi Germans were indoctrinated to blame the Jews for their troubles so the common man is being taught to blame capitalism and the capitalists. Whether under the guise of Communism, Fascism, Socialism or the new Social Gospel, this is the ideology for creating class warfare. Systematically, it has been converting the natural avarice and passions of men, bad enough when let alone, into an elaborate program for their speedy gratification at the expense of the uncommon man.

It is beside the point to argue that a capitalistic system produces unjust inequalities. Let us hasten to admit that it does. Any system will. Our point is that the anti-capitalist scapegoat ideology embraces the worst features of capitalism. The chief fault of capitalism has been its em-

phasis on material values at the expense of moral values (see Chapter 3). In its headlong pursuit of material wealth it has neglected the very morals which made its achievement possible. Its spectacular success in the United States could not have taken place without the authority of Judaeo-Christian ethics.

But, whereas capitalism weakened this moral authority by accident, the scapegoat ideology would destroy it by design. Marxian Communism openly calls for the destruction of Christian morality, and the modern doctrine of the common man calls for its destruction under the holy cloak of "democratic action." The basic appeal in either case is to the profit motive in its most negative form, that is, redistribution. American capitalism has been based on the principle that, *in order to increase the profits of the few it is necessary to increase the profits of the many*. Hence, Ford and the low-priced automobile and countless similar events. The scapegoat ideology, however, is based on the principle that *in order to increase the profits of the many the common man must first curtail the profits of the few*.

If the example of Nazi Germany has not taught us the dangers of a scapegoat ideology like this it has not taught us much. Even now, the chief reason given for prejudice against the Jews in America, according to our survey (see Chapter 2), was that they *had too much* whereas the chief reason given for prejudice against the Negroes was that they *wanted too much*. Thus both minorities tend to become scapegoats. From the one we should like to take, and from the other we should like to withhold.

Confusing the Profit System with the Profit Motive

No matter how lofty the aim, this ideology is ruinous. The goal of Christian Socialism, for example, is a state which owns or controls all wealth and administers it for the greatest good of the greatest number. To attain this goal it must abolish private capitalism and the profit system. This, the advocates of Christian Socialism reason, would merely be destroying a work of the devil which has prevented men from achieving true brotherhood.

They fail to see that in abolishing the profit system they would not be abolishing the profit motive. In sacrificing the scapegoat, they would not be purifying the common man. *On the contrary, the principal appeal of Christian Socialism, like that of Communism, is to the profit motive. It figuratively takes the common man up on a high mountain and tells him: All that you see will be yours if you will but eliminate the property owners and the profit system!*

Moreover, this ideology appeals to the profit motive in its most negative form. Its emphasis is on taking rather than on making, on the division of wealth rather than on its creation, on the partition of goods rather than on their production. In the name of equality and brotherhood, the common man is being bombarded with high-sounding phrases most of which can be reduced to one lowest common denominator: Thou *shalt* covet thy neighbor's wealth.

Collective Bargaining Becomes Collective Bludgeoning

This use of the profit motive, whether by Christians or pagans, has already had and will continue increasingly

to have serious consequences. One of the most obvious is the change in the character of the leadership of the United States in recent years. This change is from leaders who are primarily *doers* to leaders who are primarily *talkers*; from the man of principles without eloquence to the man of eloquence without principles; from the industrial genius chiefly concerned with organizing for greater production to the labor union genius chiefly concerned with organizing for a bigger share.

Symptomatic of this change is the tremendous growth of arbitration boards, fact-finding commissions, conciliation services, national, state and local labor boards. All these boards are devices to facilitate the process of *collective bargaining* between management and labor unions. Actually, they emphasize the failure of collective bargaining, which, in the absence of elementary morals and impartial laws, was bound to fail. It was doomed because leaders able to arouse the more violent passions of men could always outdo the leaders whose ability lay in organizing men's energies for orderly work. It was doomed because its collective aspect lay chiefly in the collection of overwhelming numbers to coerce a scapegoat minority. As one commentator expressed it, collective bargaining has become collective *bludgeoning*.

Thus collective bargaining has already gone far to transform the capitalistic system of making profits into an energy-consuming wrangle for dividing profits. The slogan, "solidarity forever," is itself an appeal to force rather than reason, to emotion rather than to deliberation. It means that one group of Americans should organize themselves

solidly against the rest. Therefore it is destined to create disunity instead of solidarity even among the masses and unions whom it is supposed to unite. Already we see deep schisms between the great unions, bitter jurisdictional fights between local unions, and frequent quarrels within the unions themselves. The net result, as we can now foresee, is a general decrease in the production of wealth with its inevitable consequence, inflation. The greater the quarrels over the division, the less there will be to divide, and the less there is to divide, the more ruthless will be the struggle for what remains.

In a free economy and under impartial laws, unions could play a constructive part. Under the prevailing ideology, unionism can be but an intermediate stage in the development of class warfare. The persistent appeal to the negative side of the profit motive, the emphasis upon division rather than on creation of wealth, must inevitably lead to moral anarchy and economic chaos. In addition to class against class and one pressure group against another, neighbor will be pitted against neighbor and brother against brother. The respect for law and its deliberations will increasingly give way to impetuous and violent short cuts.

Two Brands of Justice and the Resulting Legal Chaos

Already this scapegoat ideology has led to a reversal of the traditional American philosophy of jurisprudence. It has given us a theory which now dominates the Supreme Court and many of our lower courts. According to this

theory, the duty of the courts is to administer the law not on the basis of equality but on the basis of inequality. People should be judged not as though they *were* equals but in such a way as to *make* them equal.

Consequently we now have two brands of justice, one kind for the scapegoat, another kind for the common man; one kind for the employers, another kind for the unions; one kind for those with property, another kind for those without. This is known as the *general welfare* theory of jurisprudence. It calls on judges to interpret the law, not as written, but according to their own opinion of what will further the general welfare. It deliberately sets out to "lift the dead hand of the Constitution" which, among other things, prescribes that laws may be changed only by the people and their elected legislators and not by the courts. In short, it calls for a government not of laws but of lawyers, not of impartial judges but of biased reformers. As one popular journal put it quite mildly: "The *unprecedented judgment* and the *human whim* seem definitely on the increase in American jurisprudence."

The result has been growing chaos in the legal field and growing contempt for the law in every phase of American life. Never in its history has the Supreme Court been so split by dissensions or been so erratic in its legal reasoning. As already pointed out, it has virtually declared stealing, slander and violence legal *when conducted by labor unions*, thus reversing the decisions of the lower courts who had found such acts illegal. These and related decisions have had a paralyzing effect on the administration of law throughout the land. They have encouraged or-

ganized lawlessness and mass picketing to such an extent that cities and towns often find themselves virtually helpless.

Why should anyone be surprised, therefore, at such newspaper headlines as, "Greatest Crime Wave in History Sweeping the Country," which appeared so frequently toward the end of 1945? Certainly the lack of wealth or money was not the cause. Never before had so many had so much. But how could a nation expect to foster crimes of violence on an organized basis without encouraging crimes by unorganized individuals? From pushing a man out of the gateway to his plant it is only a step to pushing him off a street car or bus. From hitting him with a picket sign it is not far to hitting him with a blackjack. From overturning his auto it is not far to stealing an auto. The underlying cause for the increase in crime, we have tried to show, is the breakdown in morals generally. But hastening the process is the ideology which sanctions crime when committed by organizations in behalf of the common man.

Equality Under the Traditional American Creed

Such are some of the implications of the modern doctrine of equality and the common man and we have only begun to see its destructive consequences. These consequences are still being obscured and even delayed by the momentum of our past, a momentum gathered under the traditional American Creed with its totally different emphasis on equality.

In the young America, for the first time, the doctrine of equality received free scope. Here, for the first time, people of all degrees received wide freedom to develop their unique potentialities. How far this has gone is illustrated by the current practice of vocational guidance in the schools. Youngsters are given a battery of tests to determine their capacities and personality traits, and with these aids, are helped to choose the education and vocation which will develop their highest potentialities. The fathers may have been laborers, shoemakers or truck drivers. Their sons may become doctors, professors, businessmen or capitalists. Thus, the doctrine of equality in America, by fostering the inequalities of men, has substituted an aristocracy of talent for one of caste. There is no rigid caste system in the United States. Any man is free to become anything, including President.

Probably the most important difference between the traditional and modern concept of the common man was the absence of the scapegoat ideology with its defeatist psychology. *Equality meant giving every individual the greatest possible freedom to develop his unique inequalities.* It did not mean encouraging the individual to blame the successful man or the capitalistic system if he fell short of his goal. It fostered and cherished the inequalities of men instead of trying to regiment them through an all-powerful state. It included the thesis that a maximum of freedom and personal responsibility was impossible without a minimum of government.

As a result, the United States is today the only nation willing and able to feed and finance much of the rest of

the world, including even the socialist and totalitarian States who repudiate this American doctrine.

The Rise of the Middle Class

Under capitalism, according to Marxian Communism, the workers must inevitably grow poorer and more numerous while the owners grow richer and less numerous. *Almost the exact opposite has taken place in the United States.* The proletariat, defined as the industrial workers, have become richer and relatively less numerous while the owners have been receiving a decreasing share of the wealth. The most conspicuous development, however, has been the phenomenal growth of the middle class as a direct result of capitalism, American style.

The Marxists prophesied a rapid, inevitable polarization of classes into proletariat and bourgeoisie, with the virtual eclipse of the middle class. How far wrong they were has been clearly shown by Lewis Corey ³⁶ in an analysis of the United States Census Bureau data and other government reports. In 1870 the "proletariat" or industrial workers were 30 per cent of the gainfully employed population; in 1920 they were 37 per cent, but by 1940 had fallen to 31 per cent. In 1870 the middle class constituted 20 per cent of the gainfully employed, but by 1940 had risen to 32 per cent of the total. In short, *the middle class had become larger than the proletariat.*

Two major causes, according to Dr. Corey, were responsible: "The growing trend toward use of automatic machines and automatic plants which displaces manual work-

ers while it multiplies the number of technical-managerial and clerical employees; and the constant growth of professional and personal services, much of them to serve workers themselves as their living standards and leisure rise." He might as well have named one major cause, private capitalism as it has worked under the traditional American Creed of equality.

How this system has encouraged the unique inequalities of men and their development from common men into uncommon men is dramatically shown by Dr. Corey's data. While industrial workers, or the "proletariat," during the period 1870 to 1940 multiplied *five* times, the technical-managerial group multiplied sixteen times, salesmen and salespeople twelve times, and the salaried professional group thirteen times. The latter includes teachers, reporters and editors, actors, designers, musicians, librarians, trained nurses, religious and social workers, accountants and many new professions. The white-collar group which includes commercial travelers, sales agents, salespeople, clerks, stenographers and bookkeepers, multiplied twenty times.

Teachers in the social studies often attribute America's high standard of living to her great natural resources. Russia, Great Britain, South America, Africa have also had great resources. Dr. Corey attributes it to the industrial and technological revolutions. These were not revolutions at all but the orderly and painstaking efforts of many inventors, scientists, promoters, organizers, advertisers and other enterprisers. They represent not so much the unleashed energies of steam, water power, electricity,

coal and oil as the unleashed energies and creativeness of many individuals. The United States has had no monopoly of these resources but, under the American doctrine of equality, more common men than ever before have been enabled to become uncommon men.

This is the creed which Americans are now busily repudiating for the new doctrine of the common man and the ideology of the scapegoat. This is the creed for which socialists would now substitute the doctrine, "production for use instead of for profit." As Dr. Irving Langmuir,³⁷ scientist and Nobel prize winner, has pointed out, we are adopting some of the worst features of Communism which are now discarded in Russia, while the Russians are incorporating into their Communist government the best features of our capitalist system.

Communist Russia was also founded on the principle, *production for use instead of profit*. Since then it has gone to great lengths in restoring profit incentives. As Dr. Langmuir points out, in 1931 the Soviet Government adopted the policy that the rates of pay should be determined not by a man's *needs* but by his *services*, not by how much he could *use* but by how much he *contributed*. Therefore, industrial workers are paid wherever possible on a piecework basis with especially high rates for that part of a man's production by which he exceeded his quota.

This is exactly opposite to the recent trend in the United States. Thirty years ago, piecework and incentive rates of pay were common practice. Today, piecework and production incentives have been largely abolished as a

direct result of labor-management controversies. Individuals able and willing to produce more are often restrained by their fellow workers. *Feather bedding* and made work, such as having two workers for the work of one, or a stand-by orchestra where recorded music is being played, or a stand-by worker where musical records are being changed by an automatic turn table, have become common practice.

Today, managers of industries in Russia often receive far more, both in material rewards and in privileges, than do corresponding managers in the United States. Whereas the latter are taxed up to 85 per cent or more of their income, the Russian government has no surtaxes. It does not believe in weakening its incentives by high taxes. Instead, managers are often given homes, both winter and summer homes, staffs of servants, automobiles and chauffeurs, and extra rations.

In short, Russian Communism, having started with the scapegoat ideology of the classless society, is now deliberately cultivating the inequalities of its people; whereas the United States, whose system of equality has produced the greatest collection of talents the world has ever seen, is systematically destroying that system through a discredited scapegoat ideology.

The true issue here is not the profit motive or the profit system. The profit motive is an aspect of human nature which will be present under any system. Every system is bound to be a profit system whether it be state capitalism or private capitalism, socialism or free enterprise, efficient or inefficient, orderly or disorderly.

The true issue is the brotherhood and dignity of man. Men cannot become brothers or raise their common level by stepping on the bodies of a scapegoat minority. They cannot become brothers by joining an economic chain gang. They cannot retain their dignity and at the same time vote themselves into a regimented economy. Men cannot have their equality guaranteed by a paternalistic socialism and still remain either free or equal.

If this is true of all men, it is even truer of races. If the equality of Negroes as distinguished from individuals generally must be guaranteed by law or force, it is a poor thing at best. Negroes like whites want the kind of equality that will enable them to make the most of their inequalities. True equality springs from moral grounds which, instead of forcing people into a strait jacket, encourages every individual to make the most of himself and the individual cannot do this except insofar as he helps others do the same. This is the American Creed, with its doctrine of equality and the common man, based on the Judaeo-Christian morality. Though never fully realized, it is still man's best hope for social harmony.

7. *MEN OF GOOD WILL AND MEN OF GOOD SENSE*

MANY ROADS to the hell of race and class conflict are paved with good intentions. The laudable ideals of reformers and the methods they use are by no means synonymous. While we look apprehensively for the machinations of Fascists and Communists, group hatreds are being openly aroused by well-meaning liberals, politicians and clergymen. Their activities are doubly effective because expressed in terms of lofty ideals and sentiments. In the warm glow of these ideals the techniques used and their effectiveness in stirring up and organizing group hatreds are lost sight of.

We have already described some of these techniques in the economic struggle. Here men of good will have formalized the conflict between labor and capitalists and have inflamed class hatreds to a point probably beyond control. This is not to say that they have created class struggle out of whole cloth. Its ingredients were present first, and always will be so long as people of varying ability strive to improve their condition.

What these high-minded reformers did not appreciate was the psychological axiom that the emotions of individuals are a thousand times more explosive when organized, and that the chaotic hatreds of a group are infinitely more destructive when rationalized by an ideology. The hungry person may steal a quart of milk, but the well-fed

mob will dump thousands of gallons into the gutter and has often done so with impunity. The enraged individual may smash a factory window, but the educated emotions of a labor organization may result in crippling the machinery of an entire factory or the transportation system of an entire city and even a nation.

Physical violence and the destruction of property may be wholly repugnant to individuals as such. However, when organized and marching behind the banners of some ideology these same individuals commit mass violence and wholesale destruction with no sense of guilt. Emotions so channelized, as for instance, through the ideology of *labor vs. capital*, are more dangerous even than the relatively spontaneous outbreak of a lynching mob. The latter may be a passing incident, whereas the former is a cumulative explosive force.

The Ku Klux Klan, in its day, was an ideological movement. Its banner was the fiery cross. Though organized in secret, its course was deliberately planned and led to a long series of racial persecutions. Fortunately for race harmony in the United States, there has been little systematic cultivation of new race ideologies in recent decades. However, there are signs that new racial ideologies are in the making. The revival of the Ku Klux Klan or the creation of similar hate organizations in more virulent form has been freely predicted. The first step in this process is the provocation and aggravation of existing race prejudices.

Speaking of this in connection with the South, a keen student⁸⁸ said: "The younger Negroes, better educated

than their predecessors, readers of the violent and often incendiary Negro press, sharply intent on securing what they take to be their rights, and more resentful of the restraints under which they live, are developing a bitter hatred for the whites. The younger whites, in turn, are developing an equally bitter hatred for Negroes, while the older members of both races stand bewildered and helpless to prevent what may become a tragic clash between these tragic peoples. From without Nazi, Japanese, and American Fascist propaganda operates to set the races against each other, while Southern demagogues add to the hatreds and confusion and are valiantly aided by Northern white liberals and professional Northern Negroes."

The forces of discord from without are bad enough. What concerns us in this chapter is the needless and often reckless aggravation of race hatreds from within, by men and women whose good will so often exceeds their good sense. From the many recent examples, some of which we shall give here, one could easily write prescriptions on *How to Create Racial Conflicts in the Name of Racial Harmony*. The first of these prescriptions would have intermarriage between whites and Negroes as its principal ingredient.

Social Equality and Intermarriage

Among all the sources of tension between Negroes and whites, the most potent is the question of intermarriage. So strong are the feelings on this point that the responsible

leaders in both groups repudiate intermarriage as a goal, at least for the near future. By social equality, both whites and Negroes insist that they mean freedom from discrimination in public places and conveyances, not intermarriage.

And yet, though intermarriage and sex is the very dynamite of Negro-white relationships, this theme has been deliberately exploited in the name of racial harmony. The widely discussed novel, *Strange Fruit*, is a good example. Here intermarriage is made the touchstone of discord between whites and Negroes. This incendiary treatment of the Negro problem was written by a woman of unquestioned good will. Such treatment is not unusual in a work of fiction, but this book was hailed by many critics and a large public primarily on its merit as a social document. Its damage to the cause of racial harmony is incalculable because it has focused attention on the most inflammatory phase of Negro-white relationships.

The inflammatory nature of this issue was recently demonstrated by an incident in a Southern college. A student editor of the college paper advocated complete social equality, including intermarriage in this Southern college. The resulting reverberations reached the farthest corners of the nation. In spite of powerful protests the student editor was suspended from the paper and the paper placed under faculty censorship. In the meanwhile, the explosive issue of intermarriage had again been pushed to the fore, this time in the supersensitive South by a well-meaning student from the North.

The Difference Between North and South

No man of good will and good sense can ignore the great difference between the North and the South, especially in respect to Negroes. While the facts and principles of racial harmony are the same, regardless of geography, the habits and customs are different. These are so ingrained that they constitute forces and obstacles which must be considered if lasting progress toward racial harmony is to be made. One sign of the dangerous forces involved here was given in a resolution passed by the State House of Representatives of a Southern state on February 29, 1944. This resolution was, in part, as follows:

“Certain persons in high official and semi-official quarters acting in concert with strong subservient influences of the North, actuated by malice or ignorance or both toward the South in general and the white race in particular, taking traitorous and treasonable advantage of the critical situation brought about by the war, are seeking by insidious utterances and actions to stir up trouble and bring conflict and strife between the white race and the Negro race of the South, thereby kindling a fire that they may not be able to put out, and shaking the South from center to circumference;

“Thereby agitators of the North are playing into the hands of Nazi philosophy of conquest to first divide, then conquer;

“History and tradition should allow each race to work out its own destiny in the South in a spirit of mutual respect, confidence and helpfulness without outside interference.”

The resolution said also:

"We indignantly and vehemently denounce the intentions of all organizations seeking the amalgamation of the white and Negro races by co-mingling of the races upon any basis of equality, as being destructive to the identity and characteristics and integrity of both races, and as being hostile to the existence and preservation of the American Union of States.

"We reaffirm our belief in and our allegiance to established white supremacy as now prevailing in the South, and we solemnly pledge our lives and our sacred honor to maintaining it, whatever the cost, in war and in peace.

"That in so far as racial relations are concerned we firmly and unequivocally demand that henceforth the damned agitators of the North leave the South alone."

Representative —, who introduced the resolution, received congratulations from many members after it had been adopted with only a few dissenting "noes."

The immediate answer to this resolution, made by the Negro Citizens' Committee of the State, was in part as follows:

"Negroes throughout — disclaim any idea of amalgamation of whites and Negroes, even though, during days not far removed from 1944, white men took advantage of Negro women for immoral purposes; hence the lighter skin Negroes living in — today, for if our Negro women had been left alone, all Negroes, for the most part, would have been black."

The group also asked for full justice in the courts of the State.

The interesting point about this reply is its emphatic rejection of intermarriage as a part of intermingling. The entire episode, however, illustrates the necessity of combining good sense with good will in this realm of human relations.

In this respect the American public at large seems to have sounder sense than some of its ardent reformers. Certain reformers, by a few drastic laws, would abolish discrimination at once, both in the South and the North. The general public, in sharp contrast, seems far more democratic and moderate in its point of view. This is evidenced by their response to the following question in the nation-wide survey already mentioned.⁴

"All in all, how can these problems (of race prejudice) be handled best? a. On a national basis, that is, by the Federal Government; b. On a local basis, by each state or city handling its own problems."

<i>Answers</i>	<i>Total</i>
On a local basis	59%
On a national basis	30
In both ways	2
Don't know	9

The Civil War was fought over the issue that led to legislation freeing the Negroes by a Constitutional amendment. How far this legislation failed in bringing about the kind of racial equality we now seek is a matter of history. Some further national legislation may today be in order, but only if the public sentiment of most localities is such as to support it.

Segregation in the Schools

The segregation of whites and Negroes in the schools is quite another matter. In the South, segregation is the general practice. In the public schools of the North segregation is coming to be the exception rather than the rule. Even the private schools and endowed colleges are increasingly admitting Negroes. In spite of this liberal trend, men and women of good will sometimes handle this issue in such a manner as to increase racial animosities and retard the progress toward non-segregation.

A dramatic example of the disastrous results of mistaken good will is that of a town in New York State whose two schools suddenly became the center of a racial issue. One of these schools had been attended for many years only by Negro children whose parents now were insisting that they be enrolled in the Main School, the "white school." A committee of citizens with more good will than good sense, most of them not residents of the town or parents of the children affected, took up this cause and brought great pressure to bear on the local authorities. The New York City papers and others carried a series of stories, often inaccurate, charging this town with racial discrimination.

As a matter of fact, the Main School already had both white and Negro pupils. The local authorities pointed out that those Negro children who lived in the Main School district need only apply to be admitted. As a result, the school was ready to open its term with sixty-eight white and thirty-three Negro children. This left fifty-five Negro

children for the other school in its own district. However, the Citizens' Committee encouraged these Negro parents to continue boycotting this school, in spite of ten-dollar fines imposed on them by the local authorities. The issue had now become an ISSUE which the State Commissioner of Education was called upon to decide. His decision was that the Negro school should be closed entirely, but for reasons of economy and because the Main School was physically able to accommodate all pupils. Thereupon these fifty-five Negro children were also enrolled in the Main School, bringing the number of Negroes well above that of the sixty-eight white children.

On October eighteenth, after six weeks of strife, the Main School opened to the pupils of both schools. *Eighty-seven Negro children appeared, but only one white child.* The remainder of the white children had been registered at parochial and private schools in the community. Instead of partial race segregation there was now complete segregation.

Applying the Techniques of Class Warfare

The most ominous aspect of this episode was the readiness of citizens of good will to utilize the methods of revolutionary class warfare. The Negro residents were encouraged to act as a class in defiance of local law and local authorities. The whites of the village were condemned as a class and subjected to a barrage of adverse publicity. By this very process, the schism between whites and Negroes was made complete.

"Scoundrel, Love Your Neighbor!"

We cannot achieve the high ideal of having two neighbors love each other by calling one of them names or by hitting him over the head with a club. We shall only aggravate race prejudice if, in our zeal for the Negroes, we threaten and bear false witness against the whites.

Similarly, we only aggravate economic strife when, in the zeal for labor as a class, we defame and persecute employers and owners as a class. Coercion is a dangerous weapon though there are situations in which it may be justified.

Segregation in the Armed Forces

An ideal opportunity for the legitimate use of coercion in abolishing segregation was offered by the conscription of men for the armed services in World War II. If men of all races could be drafted to fight for the ideals of free men, they could certainly be inducted without discrimination. Here, under complete control as to health, discipline, and living conditions, a policy of non-segregation would have been practical.

If such steps had been taken on a broad scale at the very outset, rather than in dribblets as the war progressed, the results might have been astonishingly good. Probably the greatest single problem of the United States forces was that of morale. The education of soldiers with ideals worth fighting for was a battle over which indoctrination officers grew sick and confused. The explanation is simple:

Why should the Americans unreservedly fight racial persecution and political purges abroad when the evidences of race and class conflict at home were so obvious? On the one hand there was the discrimination against Negroes and non-college men right in their midst. On the other hand there were the continuous crippling strikes in war industries due to the systematic cultivation of a labor class which had grown so powerful that politicians lacked the courage to regulate strikes.

When, still afraid to pass an anti-strike law, the government finally proposed the "Work or Fight Bill," the attitude of the soldiers was expressed in the remark: "The stay-at-homes have been riding the gravy train for three years. The least they can do is to stay on." Such bitterness augurs ill for peace at home. Its lesson is that wartime coercion cannot be exercised belatedly in the military area, or in the racial field, while the class struggle for economic power is at the same time encouraged.

The President's Fair Employment Practice Committee

Outstanding as an example of good will in the racial field was the committee appointed by President Roosevelt in 1943 called the Fair Employment Practice Committee. The chief purpose of this committee was to eliminate job discrimination against Negroes and other racial groups in war industries. The committee had no legal powers to enforce its decisions. It had to rely largely on the powers and prestige of the President in wartime, and on its own abilities to marshal public opinion. Nevertheless, it under-

took its more than difficult assignment with missionary zeal.

By the end of 1945 this committee had handled over 12,000 cases according to its chairman, Malcolm Ross, with a high proportion of satisfactory adjustments. No objective estimate of its failures or resulting frictions can be made. It is quite possible that this committee was just the gadfly needed to stir the lagging conscience of America to a faster elimination of discrimination. Evidently many employers and unions have welcomed its intervention in their efforts to end discrimination. Its success was also facilitated by the exigencies of war, and the desperate need for able workers in all manufacturing centers. Nevertheless, the committee's forthright methods may have accentuated race hatreds in many instances and its effects over a period of time are as yet uncertain. Its implications will be further discussed in the chapter on legislative measures.

The New York State Anti-Discrimination Act

Hailed as one of the greatest examples of good-will legislation in our time is the Ives-Quinn Anti-Discrimination Bill, passed by the New York State Legislature in March, 1945. No doubt inspired by the F.E.P.C., this act represents a long step toward handling race problems by legislative force. The Ives-Quinn Act creates a permanent five-man commission, appointed by the governor, with salaries of \$10,000 a year, to fight discrimination in employment. It also provides fines of \$500 and jail terms of

one year for anyone found guilty of such discrimination for reasons of race, creed, color, or ancestry. The powers of the commission in matters of testimony, hearings, the development of educational programs, and the establishing of offices and personnel are very sweeping.

So far, under an unusually able administration, this act has worked far better than many expected. How well it will work under conditions of political strain and in other states which may pass similar laws remains to be seen. Massachusetts and New Jersey have now passed such laws. Race prejudice and conflict in the United States are still in a fluid state. They need not remain so. We have seen, in recent years, what men of good will can do to transform the economic struggles of growing individuals into a highly organized and legalized class warfare. We have seen them transform issues into ISSUES, labor into LABOR, capitalism into CAPITALISM. We have witnessed a period of strictly class legislation which has sanctioned and given legal standing to class distinctions as never before.

The net result has been an unprecedented growth in discrimination and industrial strife. Never in the nation's history has there been such discrimination as that now exercised between managers and employees, between foremen and employees, by unions against non-union workers, and by the members of one union against the members of another. Men of good will without good sense may yet do in the racial field what they have so disastrously achieved in the economic field.

We are painfully learning that the man of good will

may be a greater menace to society than the known criminal. The criminal works in the dark to achieve his nefarious ends. The man of good will works in the bright light of a high idealism, a broad liberalism, to put into effect his noble plans for the welfare of humanity. Although a man of absolute integrity and unquestioned sincerity, his lack of good sense may have consequences all the more disastrous. The criminal commits *crimes* of circumscribed proportions. The man of good will merely makes *mistakes*, but these mistakes may be magnificent enough to disrupt, disorganize, and even destroy an entire social order.

The mistakes of the benevolent demagogue are made possible and are magnified in proportion to the decline of moral standards among his followers.

8. A PROGRAM FOR RACE AND CLASS HARMONY

THE BROAD OBJECT of the program to be discussed in the following chapters is the historic one of the American Creed and the Liberalism of classic tradition. That object is to insure every individual, regardless of race or class, the maximum opportunity to develop his potentialities. This includes, but goes beyond, mere equality. Men can achieve equality in a totalitarian state, that is, in a state of slavery. In many parts of the world men are having equality forced upon them, an equality of poverty, of helplessness, of political and economic serfdom.

Any program for social harmony, to be effective, must include objectives, principles and methods. It is human nature to think first and most vehemently of objectives or desires. The colloquialism, "I want what I want when I want it," eloquently expresses this fact. The chief emphasis among racial, religious, and economic groups has been on objectives rather than on principles or methods.

Among the many *Bills of Rights* and lists of objectives formulated by various groups, that of the American Council on Race Relations ³⁹ seems to us one of the best and most representative. This organization defines the purposes of its program as follows:

1. Full opportunity for employment and promotion according to ability, training and experience; full access

to training facilities, full participation in labor organizations.

2. Adequate housing for all, without race restrictive covenants or other segregation devices.
3. Full access to health, welfare, recreational and community facilities.
4. Full and equal opportunities at all levels of education.
5. Full access to public places and conveyances.
6. Full rights of citizenship, including exercises of franchise and equal opportunity for public office and public employment.

These objectives, in the light of existing inequalities, represent a long and desirable step forward.

These objectives, with very slight changes, would apply equally well to the class struggle. Many reformers, however, would consider these goals wholly inadequate. Their programs for reducing the conflicts between management and unions, between employers and employees, would include such objectives as:

A modern home for every family with the government paying part of the rent out of taxes for families who cannot afford these homes.

The right to a free college education for all children.

Free medical service for all who need it, and extra government allowances for every child.

A government guarantee of a job and a minimum annual wage for all workers.

The "Bill of Rights" issued by the National Resources Planning Board ⁴⁰ includes the following: "The right to security, with freedom from fear of old age, want, de-

pendency, sickness, unemployment and accident. The right to rest, recreation, adventure. . . .”

The Dilemma of Freedom and Serfdom

It has become fashionable in our time to enumerate such rights, but without an honest statement of the costly steps by which they can be achieved. Men of sincere good will as well as cynical politicians have proclaimed the rights to an abundant life with recreation, leisure, and security for all. This is how dictators rise to power. They not only promise but often provide jobs, vacations, and security, but by what methods and at what cost! Always it has been at the expense of minorities, either racial, religious, political or economic. Always it is at the expense of freedom and democracy. Always it has been at the expense of regimentation, including labor battalions and concentration camps in one form or another. Usually it has been at the expense of bloody revolution and war.

If we wish to retain the good features of our American democracy, the principles and methods to be followed are not only as important but probably more important than the objectives sought. The liberal ideals of freedom and equal opportunity cannot be divorced from democratic and constitutional methods. Therefore, it is with methods rather than with objectives, with principles rather than with rights, that our program will primarily concern itself.

Noble idealists and impetuous reformers may well ask: Why all the fuss and qualifications when the important

thing is just to do the job? Why not get at this problem in a simple straightforward fashion?

Without doubt, the way to love one's neighbor is to be a good neighbor, and the most direct action toward that goal is often the best. The employer, for example, need not wait for anti-discrimination laws before taking direct action to eliminate racial inequalities in his factory. Labor unions, boards of education, churches, individuals can and are taking many steps toward racial equality.

Indeed, it is just because of the scope and variety of programs now under way that the emphasis on principles and methods has become so important. The actions taken in the realm of class struggle and their disastrous results have been headline news for a decade. For a review of activities in the racial field, the *Monthly Summary of Events and Trends in Race Relations*,⁴¹ prepared by the Social Science Institute of Fisk University under the direction of Charles S. Johnson, is recommended. A single issue of this bulletin shows the bewildering variety and extent of these activities. More and more religious and secular organizations, including strong pressure and political groups, have undertaken specific programs. No matter how good their intentions, these programs are likely to conflict and increase group tensions unless they agree on underlying principles.

In a situation as complicated as this, only a fool or very naive person would claim to have a detailed or final program. However, in respect to certain principles, considerable agreement should be possible, because these

principles are the very a-b-c's of human nature and human relationships. These principles, if recognized, will serve as guideposts to the objectives and methods of any program.

The Emphasis on People Rather Than on Race or Class

The basic principle in the program proposed here is that *primary emphasis should be placed on people as human beings rather than as members of a particular race or class.* This principle seems so obviously true and yet it is the exact opposite of the principle which governs so many current activities.

Consider, for instance, the efforts to promote and finance Negro colleges, so that Negroes may have an education equivalent to that of whites. As a halfway measure, this program has probably been desirable. There are now over eighty colleges entirely for Negroes. Nevertheless, this program violates our basic principle. The more it is extended, the more fully it will confirm the principle of segregation and the emphasis on race rather than on human beings.

To affirm that Negroes, as such, should have the same education as whites, is a wholly reactionary and negative viewpoint. Even if they can go to Negro colleges, this does not insure an equal education. To affirm that every individual, regardless of race, should have the same educational opportunity is to state a positive and forward-looking guide to action. The emphasis then will cease to be on more colleges for the Negroes. It will not even be on

more Negroes in the white colleges. It will be on impersonal standards so that individuals will be admitted on a competitive, sportsmanlike basis. If, in this manner, more and more Negroes win their way into the regular colleges, it will be an ideal solution.

While an impartial, competitive basis for college admissions may, at the outset, seem disadvantageous to many Negroes, especially in view of educational handicaps in their earlier years, it should prove a great stimulus to a freer and broader educational practice generally. The colleges, above all, must set the example in respect to this basic tenet of liberalism, the treatment of humans as humans.

The public and state universities especially, whose students are educated largely at the taxpayers' expense, should be among the first to adopt impartial standards. The students who wish to benefit from such public funds should be amenable to the admission of candidates on the basis of personal merit regardless of race or creed. Fortunately, the science of psychology and educational testing has progressed to the point where impartial measures of abilities and personality traits, while not perfect, are very useful.

Illustrating the harmful emphasis on race instead of individuals is the experience of one employer who had made special efforts to insure racial equality in his plant. At the time of the following incident he had more Negroes in his plant than whites. A Negro who had been having considerable trouble with his foreman finally came to this employer with the complaint: "It's about time us colored

folks had a break around here!" Thereupon, the employer was able to express the new policy which for some time had been growing out of his experience. "From now on," he said, "no one in the plant will have special consideration simply because he is black, or for that matter, because he is white. Your case, for instance, will be dealt with strictly on its merits, just like any other."

In relating this incident the employer admitted that in his desire to be fair with the Negroes he had gone to the other extreme, and had thus encouraged a feeling of race consciousness. This would have been only natural in an idealistic employer trying to compensate for the past. Nevertheless, it illustrates the danger of thinking in terms of race rather than in terms of human beings. The idea of fair employment practices is most praiseworthy, but when it is applied in terms of racial rights, it becomes destructive.

Jim Crowism and the Quota System

Jim Crow railroad coaches and similar segregation devices represent the emphasis on race rather than on human beings. It is to be hoped that Americans in all parts of the country will rapidly repudiate such inhuman practices. At the same time, there is considerable danger from well-meaning people who advocate the use of a quota system. According to this system if thirty per cent of the inhabitants of a state are Negroes, and ten per cent are Jews, then the same percentage of Negroes and Jews must be enrolled in the colleges, or employed in the stores and

factories. By this principle each town, city and state would determine quotas or percentages according to which races and religions would be distributed or employed.

This method appeals strongly to those who would, for instance, like to limit the number of Jews admitted to a certain medical school; or to those who would like to increase quickly the number of Negroes hired by a certain factory. Actually, the quota system is Jim Crowism in reverse. It is a subtle and dangerous form of Jim Crowism. In the name of equality it discriminates entirely on the basis of race. Under the guise of doing away with discrimination it would set up an elaborate system to freeze discrimination. Its emphasis is on membership in a race *above all other human considerations*, and, therefore, it is diametrically opposed to our basic principle.

Jim Crowism and Palestine for the Jews

The idealistic movement toward making Palestine a haven for the Jews is really a concession to the principle of segregation. It is a voluntary form of Jim Crowism, as though Jews had chosen a railroad coach for their exclusive use in their ride through this life. Personal liberty demands that individuals have the right to choose their own friends and associates, even to the extent of forming social clubs exclusively for Jews or Gentiles, men or women, Yale or Harvard alumni, fishermen or golfers, et cetera. But the artificial segregation of a people into a separate nation, even though born of desperation and nostalgia, is a step backwards. It represents a retreat from, rather than

a facing of, reality. It is action based on the affirmation of race and the negation of humanity, and, as such, directly opposed to the basic principle of our program.

A much more subtle violation of this principle is represented by the activities of a group of educators who organized a series of inter-racial parties under the name, "Tolerance Can Be Fun."⁴² This "experiment in understanding" in its early stages was reported as follows: "Parents of Horace Mann-Lincoln School's Neighborhood Committee are backing their belief in democracy this winter with \$3,500 to pay for a series of inter-racial parties for children. They're inviting 300 children of the region, selected on the basis of race and national background, to Saturday afternoons of play at the school. The children have fun, get acquainted and do not know they are being used as a friendly polyethnic group.

"At the first meeting there were plenty of American types: Negro and white, Portuguese, Hungarian, Italian, Austrian, Chinese, Japanese, Swedish and Irish. The children, a little awed, brought along parents. Music, art, games and discussions were offered the children. Their own parents sighed with pleasure, and this unit of the Parent Teachers Association of Teachers College schools knows the experiment will be a big success."

No matter what the reported success of this particular experiment—in the eyes of its enthusiastic sponsors, it could not avoid succeeding—it is based on a negative principle of race. Its children were selected on the basis of race by some arbitrary quota system. Even though the children were not informed of the primary purpose of the

parties, these teachers and parents must have had a very naive concept of children's intelligence if they assumed that the children could be kept in ignorance, especially in view of the doctrinaire enthusiasm of the experimenters.

Such emphasis on race is perfectly calculated to create unnecessary mental hazards. Its psychology is like that of the golfer who always has trouble on the seventh hole, though that hole is no more difficult than any other. The more he concentrates on this one hole, the greater a mental hazard it becomes.

If "tolerance can be fun" parties were arranged solely to bring together capitalists and wage earners, or rich children and poor children, the same kind of mental hazard would be set up. Such artificial congregation, like arbitrary segregation, might promote the very class consciousness it was intended to erase. An employer is not tolerated by employees simply because he is an employer, but because he is a good employer. A wage earner is not entitled to respect simply because he represents Labor, but because he is a good worker. Negroes are not entitled to respect because they are Negroes, but because they are good Negroes. Whites are not entitled to respect from Negroes or from other whites just because they are whites, but because they are good whites. People do not become friends, fall in love, or come to understand each other just because they make up their minds to do so. Whites do not flock to hear Paul Robeson or Marian Anderson because they are Negroes. Neither whites nor Negroes clamor to see Joe Louis because he is a Negro, but because he is a great fighter.

In short, the foundations for mutual tolerance and respect are those qualities in individuals which transcend race or class. These, and not the accident of birth or economic status, should be emphasized.

The principle we are discussing may be restated in terms of the following corollaries:

The more the race problem is treated as mainly a race problem, the poorer the chances for a solution.

The more class problems are treated as mainly class problems, the sharper class consciousness and class conflict will grow.

Conversely, the greater the emphasis on individuals as such, that is, on their abilities and possibilities, the greater the likelihood of race and class harmony.

Psychology, for example, is rapidly developing tests of human capacities and abilities. Such tests are being increasingly used by employers in the selection of *qualified applicants*. These tests do not measure a person's race, religion, or economic status. They measure only his abilities as an individual. Such tests are by no means complete or perfect, but they illustrate a scientific trend based on the very principle we are discussing. They have not yet and never may prove that all races are equal; but they have pretty clearly proved that many individuals of *any* race are superior—or inferior—to many individuals of any other race.

Discrimination Based on Union Membership

One of the objectives of the American Council on Race Relations is "full participation in labor unions" without

discrimination against race. In the field of class conflict this objective should include the right to employment without discrimination based on union membership. The employer should no more be allowed to reject employees because they are members or not members of a union than because they are whites or blacks.

There was a time when the first reason for firing or not hiring a man was his membership in a union. That condition has been remedied. We have now gone to the other extreme so that in many industries no worker may be hired or retained unless he is a union member. In short, the emphasis is not on the man but on the group, the union. *The closed shop is the complete embodiment of this negative and discriminatory principle.* It is perfectly calculated to create and perpetuate class hatreds.

At first thought the slogan, *human rights are more important than property rights*, may seem to exemplify the principle of emphasis on humans rather than on groups. Analysis reveals that just the contrary is true. What this slogan really implies is that the rights of humans who have no property are more important than the rights of humans who own property. This is a perfect principle of disunity and discrimination. It automatically elevates all those without property and just as automatically degrades all those with. It might just as well be said that the human rights of women without husbands are more important than the rights of women with husbands, or that the human rights of those who have no job are more important than the rights of those who do.

The second basic principle in our suggested program is

the reliance on moral force rather than the force of special legislation. What do we mean by moral force? In current discussions this term is much abused. Any kind of pressure short of physical violence is likely to be called *moral force*. Most often it refers to the influence of pressure groups or the force of public opinion. *These forces can just as well be immoral as moral.*

By moral force we mean the application of moral principles to a given situation. Treat people as human beings rather than as members of a certain race or class, is a moral principle. The Golden Rule and the commandment, Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself, is such a principle as are the Ten Commandments which give it more definite meaning. The specific commandments, Thou shalt not bear false witness, Thou shalt not steal, Thou shalt not kill, are the moral cornerstones of any legal system whose object is justice and the brotherhood of man.

To the extent that our existing laws are animated by these morals, to that extent special race and class legislation will be unnecessary. Conversely, the greater the quantity of such special legislation and the bureaus necessary to implement it, the sharper the schisms between races and classes are likely to be. It is far better to have millions of people thoroughly educated in the basic morals of human relationships than to have thousands of policemen and courts or commissions trying to enforce numerous and complicated laws.

Our third principle is that the major emphasis in any program for social harmony should be on education. Education is a slow process but much surer and more lasting

in its effects than probably any other. At present the major emphasis seems to be on the methods which promise the quickest results. These are political action and the power of pressure groups. This makes race and especially class issues a political football which tends to increase social conflicts faster than sound education can reduce them. Class warfare, under this disastrous emphasis, may already have reached a point beyond control. There is great danger that the political and legislative emphasis in the racial field will bring about a similar situation.

For these reasons, it is especially important that the heaviest emphasis be placed on the forces of education, both secular and religious, both formal and informal.

These major principles, the emphasis on individuals rather than race or class, on moral force rather than legislation, on education rather than political shortcuts, complement each other in very practical fashion. When applied to the many problems of a detailed program, they serve as a useful criterion. For instance, in choosing between various educational methods, they imply this corollary:

The regular channels of education are preferable to unusual channels, and standard courses are preferable to courses devoted specially to race and class prejudice.

If the public schools were to inaugurate a special course devoted entirely to race relations, it would be a violation of this principle. A special course to teach the children of well-to-do and poor families how to get along with each other would be contrary to this principle. The "tolerance

can be fun" parties already discussed represent an unusual type of educational activity, one outside the regular school channels.

The Springfield, Pittsburgh, and Newark programs, as popularly described, would seem to be contrary to this principle. As a matter of fact, the Springfield Plan incorporates its racial teachings into the regular courses of history, civics, geography, and others. The lessons of racial harmony are not artificially administered like pills out of a special bottle labelled "For Race Relations Only!" On the contrary, the emphasis is on better human relationships generally.

The facts about political and moral equality are an integral part of American history and the American Creed, and their practical application is a distinct feature of civics. Where then should the scientific facts about racial differences or equality be taught? In view of the controversial nature of the subject, it is doubtful whether they should be taught at all, as such, except in advanced courses of social psychology. *What can and should be taught, in all grade schools, are the facts about individual differences and potentialities regardless of race or class.*

All children should be taught that some individuals are by nature more gifted than others, whether poor or rich, black or white. All children should be taught, even more carefully, that this accident of birth is not the decisive factor; that a mediocre child who is industrious and ambitious can develop abilities which far surpass those of the naturally brilliant child who will not work or practice.

They should be taught that this applies not only to the

acquisition of a good mind but of a good personality, a good character, a strong physique, and the cultivation of many special skills. They should be shown that these facts are true of all people, regardless of race or class; that some Negroes are naturally smart just as some whites are naturally stupid, and vice versa; that, regardless of their natural endowment, some whites and some Negroes never grow up into successful men and women, and that some do; that many more in both races could achieve success if they tried hard enough.

They should be imbued with the fact that inferiority and failure are not an accident of birth, race, or class, but rest largely with the individual. From the poorest families, whether black or white, have come many of our ablest men and women, and from our *best families*, whether white or Negro, have come many of our greatest scoundrels and failures.

The time is near when the grade schools will teach these and other elementary facts of human psychology just as they now teach the elementary facts of physiology, geography, and English. There has already been much agitation for the teaching of *mental hygiene*. Unfortunately for our times, the simplest facts of mental hygiene have been obscured and distorted by the fallacies and exaggerations of psychoanalysis and psycho-analytic psychiatry. With their emphasis on the morbid and the abnormal, these have made the teaching of mental hygiene positively dangerous.⁴³

In contrast with psychoanalysis and psychiatry, the emphasis of psychology is on the normal, rather than the

abnormal, as illustrated by the topics for teaching just enumerated. A course in elementary psychology would wholly avoid the vocabulary of phobias, inhibitions, repressions, oppressions, racial tensions, inferiority complexes, maladjustment, compensation, persecution, to mention only a few of the least technical terms, and talk in the ordinary language of everyday living. It would take up the questions of race prejudice in their proper perspective, instead of making them a special and conspicuous issue. It would give just as much attention to the problems of class hatreds as to those of racial hatreds, but in terms of their common denominators which are jealousy, false pride, covetousness, personal incompetence, and ignorance.

Such a course in the grammar schools would not violate our principle against special courses, because it would deal with the facts of personal and social growth generally. A similar course on the adolescent or high-school level is also desirable, because this is the stage at which the energies of sex add their tremendous pressure either for or against personal integrity and social harmony. Here again, the questions of race and group conflict could be dealt with in a natural manner.

Such courses are just as basic to the understanding of human relationships as are courses in arithmetic and science to the understanding of material relationships. Without this foundation the other social studies, history, civics, and economics, must remain unintelligible and confusing.

While the opinions of the general public in regard to

programs for social harmony are not necessarily correct, they cannot be safely ignored. After all, the problems to be dealt with are problems in public psychology. In the nation-wide survey already referred to the following question was asked: "As a means of reducing class prejudice and race hatreds, which *one* or *two* of the following could do the most good?"

Agencies Named

Churches and Sunday schools	55%
Grammar and high schools	54
Government laws and bureaus	21
Public meetings and speeches	14
Labor unions and employers	12

Thus the general public tends to confirm the principle that education is more important than legislation. Our preliminary tests showed that if parents had been included as a category, they, as is usual in matters of this kind, would have been voted primarily responsible.

The parents are usually held responsible for juvenile delinquency, spoiled children, and many other problems, including race prejudice. What is generally overlooked is that the parents themselves have increasingly become the product of formal and informal education outside the home, and that the current theories and practices of child training are largely the result of modern science and secular education. Therefore, to blame the parents is to get exactly nowhere. Legally and morally they must always be responsible for their children, but how they discharge their responsibilities will increasingly depend on the kind of education they receive outside the home.

9. THE REFORM OF PUBLIC EDUCATION

IN HIS REVIEW of three recent books on the Negro problem, Walter Davenport⁴⁴ made this critical comment: "That book for which we hanker will, we hope, recognize that Negro education for the white man is even more essential than white man education for the Negro." This is an epigrammatic reminder that the *kind* of education is more important than its *duration*, that its *quality* is more critical than its *quantity*.

The emphasis in our time has been on the quantity or the years of education. The major premise of the American system has been that the *more* education a man has, the *better* man he will be. A college graduate will be better than a high-school graduate, and a high-school graduate better than the person who has completed only the grade school. In 1889 the total enrollment in colleges was 55,687. In 1938 it was 1,346,856.⁴⁵ In 1947 it promises to approach 2,000,000 or almost thirty-six times as many as in 1889. Over 80 per cent of all children are now getting all or part of a high school education. All races and classes have shared in this great increase even though inequalities between them still exist.

And yet, with more years of education than ever, the objective facts of social behavior are these:

1. The highest divorce rate in the history of divorce statistics. At present more than one out of every five mar-

riages ends in divorce.⁴⁶ If the recent rate of increase continues for the next twenty years, *every other marriage* will end in divorce.⁴⁷ Divorce is one type of conflict which cannot be attributed either to poverty or lack of education. Indeed, the greater the wealth and education, the higher the divorce rate. Now investigations are increasingly demonstrating that broken homes are a principal cause of juvenile delinquency.

2. A steady increase in the frequency of crime among those under twenty-one, reaching an all-time high in number and percentage in 1945.¹⁹

3. A particularly sharp growth in juvenile delinquency, especially stealing, gang violence, and sex irregularities.¹⁸

4. A continuously high rate in major crimes throughout the United States. Major crimes include murder, manslaughter, rape, robbery, aggravated assault, burglary, larceny, and auto thefts.⁴⁸

5. The highest rate of strikes and industrial conflicts between 1934 and 1946 on record.⁴⁹

6. The rejection of well over four million young men as mentally or physically unfit for military service, even of a limited kind. This appalling degree of unfitness, especially in the case of psycho-neurotic 4F's, was due in large part to the wrong kind of education rather than to its lack in quantity. The need for better physical training was especially obvious.

7. Reliable records of race riots or crimes due to racial hatreds are lacking. Yet it is generally held that racial tensions are higher and quarrels more frequent than at any time in decades. Obviously, it is with the improvement of education, among whites as well as Negroes, rather than with its equalization, that we should be first of all concerned. Where should this improvement begin?

Many educators have acknowledged the tragic failure

of our great educational system. Probably the most intensive evaluation of education ever made was the Regents Inquiry into secondary school education in New York State. The study was made under a grant of half a million dollars from the General Education Board, of the Rockefeller Foundation. Three years were required by a large body of the country's leading educators to complete the work. The director of the survey, Luther Gulick,⁵⁰ summarized its extensive findings as follows:

"The Inquiry found, in spite of the fact that New York's schools are as good as those in other states, that we are turning out of school a vast number of boys and girls each year who are not at all ready for adult life. They have no idea what work means, what sorts of opportunities there are, how to look for work, or how to work when they get a job. They are not prepared to be useful citizens, or to enter community or home life. They do not know how to take care of their own bodies or minds. Few have implanted in them any seeds of individual inner life and growth, any skill in working with others, or any protections against mob hysteria, propaganda, shallow prejudice, or economic gold bricks.

"We of the Inquiry suspect that America cannot be governed satisfactorily or administered industrially in the days that lie ahead on the basis of the kind of schooling this 80 per cent of boys and girls now receive."

The school products described in this summary are perfect material for the development of criminal and anti-social behavior. They are the ready prey of the exploiters of race and class hatreds. They are easy victims for the racketeers who fatten on the immature and the insecure.

They are gullible dupes of demagogues who promise them the jobs and privileges which they are unfitted to obtain or retain by themselves.

Ethical Training in the Public Schools

The evidences enumerated above point to what is probably the greatest single weakness in secular education, namely, its failure to teach the elementary manners and morals of social behavior. That is why the problem today is not just one of race conflict or even class conflict. These are but the larger manifestations of the inability of whites to live peacefully with whites, Jews with Jews, husbands with their wives, parents with their children, individuals with their community.

In his letter appointing a committee to study the curriculum, President Conant of Harvard University said: ". . . Unless the educational process includes at every level of maturity some continuing contact with those fields in which value judgments are of prime importance, it must fall far short of the ideal. The student in high school, in college and in graduate school must be concerned, in part at least, with the words 'right' and 'wrong' in both the ethical and the mathematical sense."

The home and the church no longer teach the moral laws with their old-time authority. Their authority has been displaced by the secular schools. These, far from educating their pupils in basic morals, have waged an effective campaign against the *old-fashioned virtues*. They have quite thoroughly deflated the morals of the older

generations. This has been especially true of progressive educators who have emphasized *self-expression* at the expense of *self-discipline* and personal originality at the cost of social morality.

Some Schools Are Adopting Moral Codes

Because of this moral vacuum in public education, the recent action of eighty-three New York City junior high schools representing about 100,000 pupils is highly significant. Under the guidance of associate superintendent, Dr. Elias Lieberman, a committee of students elected by popular vote drew up the following code of moral conduct:

"1. I will never, knowingly, by word or deed, injure anyone's person, feelings or property in any manner.

"2. I will always respect the religious beliefs of others as I will respect my own.

"3. I will show courtesy to other people at all times, particularly to my elders.

"4. I will abide by the laws and regulations of my school and community.

"5. I will be honest with myself and others and I will practice cleanliness of mind and body at all times."

This code of behavior was adopted by a majority vote of the eighty-three schools. The approval with which it was received, according to Dr. Lieberman, suggests the essential faith of the young people in the validity of a moral standard which applies equally to all. "So bold an experiment in student democracy," he asserted, "on so large a scale has not before been attempted in any part of

our country. Perhaps the success of this effort will inspire similar actions elsewhere."

This hope seems well on the way to being realized, judged by the inquiries and actions of other schools throughout the country. The New York City children are now working on a manual to supplement the code. This will apply to specific situations in the home, the street, the movies, the school, and at work. Thus, the abstract concept of *the dignity of man* will be given practical meaning through definite ethical rules.

The similarity of this five-point code to certain old-fashioned morals, including some of the Ten Commandments, does not detract from its significance. Quite the contrary, it points all the more clearly to the greatest social tragedy of our time, to the completeness with which our civilization has fouled its own nest. In one century our civilization has managed to mess up its moral heritage from all the many centuries before. Therefore, while their overeducated, miseducated elders discuss the new juvenile delinquency in terms of housing, recreation, poverty, discrimination and other secondary symptoms, the juveniles themselves are groping toward its primary causes and cures. While our modern social philosophers and self-styled liberals concentrate on grandiose programs for the *rights* of man guaranteed by a regimented economy, our youngsters are struggling back to the moral and spiritual values of *duty* and *personal responsibility*.

One correspondent, in reporting this project, states that codes of behavior in the past have been written mostly by adults, and though framed in appropriate phrases of cau-

tion and didactic advice, have failed to register. This failure, he claims, is what prompted Dr. Lieberman to call upon the students to develop their own principles of conduct. Without detracting in the slightest from this admirable project, one might just as well say that the rules of football, chess, music, spelling, and arithmetic should be worked out by the pupils democratically because the existing rules have been codified too pedantically by generations of elders. *It is not because the codes of behavior have been written by adults, but because they have also been undermined by adults* that Dr. Lieberman and his students now find it necessary to prepare and adopt their own code.

Can we imagine junior high-school pupils formulating and adopting, through committees and popular vote, their own multiplication table, their own algebraic formulae, their own axioms of geometry? And yet, this would be no more incongruous than what they are having to do in the field of moral codes. Our educational system has remained highly authoritarian, and rightly so, about the rules of arithmetic and the axioms of science. Obviously, it would be silly for children at this late day to work out their own arithmetical systems and scientific laws. These are not matters to be decided by popular vote. They are matters of right and wrong, of universal laws inherent in the nature of things, of convention and tradition sanctioned by centuries. But in the field of ethics and human conduct we have not only denied the universal validity of moral laws, we have even adopted the childish notion that nations and individuals are so different that they must choose

their own moral codes, in accordance, moreover, with the conditions of modern times. And then we bewail the fact that juvenile delinquency, social conflicts, and world wars are increasing!

Restoring the Rules of Courtesy

In the spring of 1945, a public grade school which, a few years ago, was nationally known for its advanced progressive education, undertook a revolutionary program. It will be remembered that the criticism levelled against traditional education by the advocates of progressive education was at its emphasis on uniform, rigid routines. For these, progressive educators substituted methods calculated to give children much more freedom, much greater scope for originality and creativeness. Among the routines which suffered in this process, aside from spelling, writing and arithmetic, were the routine habits of courtesy and self-discipline.

Now this once extremely progressive school had established a program to develop and promote habits of courteous behavior. A committee of teachers working with the leaders of various children's groups had mapped out the details. After several weeks the whole school met in assembly to hear the children report on the part their groups had undertaken in the project. Among the examples of courtesy reported were the following: not interrupting, waiting one's turn, keeping voices quiet and pleasant, not running in the halls, and the plain, everyday use of manners such as "Thank you," "Please," and "Excuse me."

Good manners and courteous behavior are often described as traditions or customs peculiar to a certain people. Actually, they are much more. Many of them are based squarely on the universal moral laws which define the dignity of the individual. *They are the a-b-c's of loving one's neighbor.*

The Values vs. the Facts of Life

Recently a teacher in the tenth grade asked her class in hygiene to vote on the subject they wished to discuss. The majority voted for a discussion of how to have intercourse without the risk of pregnancy. This incident stems from a fallacy which underlies all education, namely, that if people are taught the facts, their conduct will be more intelligent. The campaign in behalf of sex education in the schools is an excellent illustration. Its entire emphasis has been on the physiological facts of sex almost to the complete neglect of its spiritual and moral values.

The more people are taught about the physiology of sex, the more likely they are to exploit sex for purely selfish ends. This is not an argument for fewer facts, but for a greater emphasis on the ethics of sex, for example, the codes of chastity, of marriage, of having children.

More and more colleges are giving courses in marriage. These are adding still more facts to the top-heavy load on a foundation whose moral cement is crumbling. The American people are already better educated in the scientific facts of life than any nation in history, and yet divorce rates and juvenile sex delinquency have reached a

new high. The family, which is the very foundation for training in the rules of social harmony, has sunk to its lowest point as a source of moral authority. Every policeman working in a home community is aware of this situation.

Without definite, as well as general, moral laws, facts are destructive and moral authority is impossible. This is just as true for world peace and racial harmony as it is for a united family.

Ethics without Sectarianism

"You adults cry out about juvenile delinquency and youthful criminals," wrote a returned soldier⁵¹ in an article on education recently. "Why, in the name of common sense then, may we not have trained religious teaching and leadership in public schools? Not sectarian or denominational, but teaching on general morals and conduct. . . ." The five-point code of the New York schools is an excellent demonstration of what can be done on a strictly non-sectarian basis. Even though Dr. Lieberman was inspired by deep religious convictions, as may have been many members of the student committee, the resulting code can hardly be condemned by any religious denomination.

The least that educators and social scientists, not to mention religious leaders, can do is to excavate and restore the moral precepts which modern civilization has been so busily burying. This is not the task of a month or a year, but certainly it is quicker and surer than beginning

from scratch, as though we were the only people who had ever lived. Professor Ralph Barton Perry of Harvard University has set a brilliant example in his book, *Puritanism and Democracy*.⁵² For generations now Puritanism has been held up to scorn and ridicule. We have been taught to repudiate and to live down our Puritan past. Perry's scholarly book, however, separates the chaff from the wheat, and shows that the basic morals of the Puritans constitute the very foundations for democracy and the dignity of man. He points out the ethical precepts and spiritual values of the Puritans which are far more important than their sectarian peculiarities. In the words of one reviewer, Gerald W. Johnson, his book is a "logical, lucid and powerful argument for more attention to certain old-fashioned virtues that are in no danger of being overemphasized in the modern world." Among these virtues are absolute truthfulness, keeping one's word, simplicity of speech or avoidance of "double-talk," moderation in living habits, thrift, respect for the persons and property of others, hospitality for the strange and the needy, humility, chastity, and many others.

Whenever a real or fancied weakness in our society becomes sufficiently notorious, the fashion is to hit on some specific remedy or panacea. In the field of mental problems the fashion is to establish clinics for *abnormal* treatment. In many communities the rage has been to establish recreational centers for juvenile delinquency. In the educational field the practice has been to institute a new course under a new name. Education has long been supposed to be a preparation for life. Because it has not been,

it has recently become popular to add special courses in marriage, in racial relations, in labor and industrial relations, in international relations, etc., etc.

This tendency must end. It is merely creating a Tower of Babel with its inevitable complete chaos. What we are suggesting here is *the restoration and reinterpretation, on every school level and in every course, of the ethical principles most appropriate*. Fortunately, there are a few areas in which the pedagogy of applied ethics still exists. Conspicuous among these is the field of competitive games and sports. In the departments of physical education the rules of tennis, hockey, basketball, track, and many others are scrupulously taught. All the specific rules of these games are ethical rules which rest on the underlying concept of sportsmanship. This concept is that playing the game according to the rules is more important than winning.

Sportsmanship exemplifies the meaning of moral laws in any phase of life, in that it calls for obedience to the rules regardless of the immediate practical results. This concept can well be taught in the grade schools. I still remember the discussion precipitated by my fourth-grade teacher over one of our copybook maxims, *honesty is the best policy*. She challenged us with the statement that to be honest because it was good policy was next to being dishonest. Honesty, she told us, was a moral principle to be observed without giving thought to whether it paid. Even though it paid in the long run, there were many times when it might bring us a spanking or some other punishment. "You should be honest because it is right,

not because it is smart," she said. Though I did not fully understand her at the time, I have since come to recognize this as the essence of all moral ethics expressed in the dictum: the end does not justify the means.

Sportsmanship and Racial Equality

There is probably no field of human endeavor in which equality is so absolute as in the field of competitive sports. The audience at a prize fight may cheer the white contender, but the Negro champion is judged with a strict consideration for the rules. The runners in a race may be poor or rich. They may represent the Young Men's Hebrew Association, the Knights of Columbus, the Harlem Y.M.C.A., and many other religious or racial groups. Nobody cares. Their individual efforts under absolutely impartial conditions are all that count. The Olympic Games are probably the closest approach to a social plan for international harmony ever achieved. The reason in all these instances is the same, a moral code which insures every race, every nation, every individual, equality of opportunity and treatment.

It is not surprising, therefore, that psychologists should find competitive sports and games contributing more to personality or the ability to work and play with people than any other activity.¹ Every athletic coach or director of physical education can testify to the efficacy with which the heat of strenuous physical competition burns away racial and class hatreds. Such competition without the laws of sportsmanship would intensify and breed ha-

treds. Under an accepted moral order it leads to cooperation and mutual respect. And yet, the standard competitive sports, which could serve as the foundation for so much in the entire field of social harmony, are not even required activities in many grade schools and high schools.

The commandment, *Thou shalt not bear false witness against thy neighbor*, has become newly acceptable in the pedagogy of race relations. What a contradiction of good sportsmanship and morality it would be not to extend such teaching to the fields of class and group relationships. The epithets, *scab*, *plutocrat*, *Tory*, *greedy vs. the needy*, and many others, can no more be justified than such names as *nigger*, *kike*, or *dago*. The terms, *progressive*, *reactionary*, *liberal*, *conservative*, *planned welfare*, *public interest*, are used today as emotional and deceptive tools of propaganda rather than as honest labels.

The Semantics of Loving One's Neighbor

Through the chaos of our age we occasionally glimpse the fact that most people are much better than they seem to be. Whether black or white, rich or poor, Russian or American, the closer their acquaintance the more human they find each other. What often sets race against race and class against class are false ideologies and phrases. The terms, *capital* and *labor*, for instance, represent an ideology which has helped to create the very class struggle which they so loosely describe. A worker, no matter how skilled or highly paid, is converted into a class-conscious laborer, simply because he does not own the fac-

tory. A factory owner or manager, no matter how just or liberal, automatically becomes an exploiter of labor and an oppressor of the wage earners. Much the same is true of the ideologies represented by such names as liberal, conservative, Fascist, Communist, and many others.

The misuse of these terms and their emotional ideologies is basically a problem in honesty. All of them are cases of bearing false witness. Semantics is really a question of morality. The accurate definition of words and their correct application to individuals and groups is not just an academic specialty, but a moral obligation of all educators. On every level of education, in every subject, educators should be developing the codes and disciplines governing the honest use of words.

Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself includes far more than an attempt to guarantee every person a minimum living standard or a free education of the kind we now have.

The Ethics of the Physical Sciences

The physical sciences, physics, chemistry, biology, and mathematics, have developed ethical values to a high degree. First among these is the accurate definition and use of terms. These sciences cannot tolerate for a moment the loose language which the social sciences, psychology, psychiatry, sociology, economics, and political science take as a matter of course. Honesty, telling the truth, respect for the rights of fellow scientists, are not only matters of principle but are embodied in the very tech-

niques of scientific formulae and research. Nothing in the field of human endeavor can equal the painstaking honesty in these fields.

Small wonder, therefore, that the accomplishments of physical science are so miraculous. The students are not asked to learn the elements of physics by popular discussion or by personal experience. This would be a waste of the accumulated experience of centuries. They are given the formulae and asked to learn them. They are given established experiments and asked to do them, strictly according to directions. When they have mastered the established knowledge of the past, then they are capable of doing creative work and having opinions worth discussing.

Consequently, the areas of agreement in science have continually grown and the areas of disagreement shrunk. If Japanese, German, Russian, English, and American aviation engineers were to meet in the midst of war they could discuss objectively and amicably the relative merits of their airships, no matter how they differed on other matters. In the social studies, however, we are arguing today about matters which our ancestors took for granted thousands of years ago. To mention but two, should children be spanked and can a nation borrow its way to lasting prosperity.

To make explicit the morals of physical science so that they can be applied to the social studies and to the problems of race and class conflict is one of education's most pressing problems. Through the high school courses in physics, chemistry and biology, the moral precepts: thou

shalt not steal; thou shalt not covet, thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself, could be objectively and practically taught. They apply not only to pupils' relationships in the laboratory, but also to the accuracy and honesty of the procedure involved.

Such morals are far more important to harmony than are, for instance, the scientific facts about race equality which educators are now trying to teach. These so-called facts can readily arouse controversy. Even in psychology, which is the science of human abilities, there is much disagreement as to what the facts mean. The authority or *authoritarianism* of physical science *lies not in its facts, but in its methods, its morals.*

The Teaching of American History

On one area for the reform of secular education there is widespread agreement, that is, the study of American history. The nation-wide survey of students' knowledge of American history by the *New York Times*⁵³ revealed a woeful degree of ignorance among college freshmen. This survey was criticized for emphasizing dates and facts at the expense of ideas and values. However, if recent experience is any indication, the knowledge of what America means is also sadly lacking. The indoctrination of soldiers with the ideals for which we were fighting certainly revealed this lack. This should not have been surprising.

For many years now, and until very recently, it has been academically fashionable to debunk American history and our country's heroes. The Constitution has been

described as the compromise of bickering conservatives rather than as one of the greatest moral documents any nation ever devised. The religious and ethical foundations of the American Creed have been obscured by strictly economic interpretations. The American Revolution has been reduced to the level of a petty tradesmen's quarrel. The Civil War has been pictured as primarily a business battle between the North and the South, rather than as a struggle over the moral issues of slavery.

The treatment of the episode of George Washington and the cherry tree is indicative, and so are its consequences. In my early school days this episode was forcefully used to drive home the lesson of telling the truth, regardless of consequences. The stature of George Washington was thereby greatly enhanced. The ridicule of this episode since then goes almost hand in hand with the ridicule of honesty as an absolute principle. In the field of politics especially, false promises, double-talk, and outright lying are now openly condoned. In his testimony before Congress a few years ago a presidential candidate glibly dismissed a false statement of great importance as having been merely a campaign promise, made with full knowledge of its falseness. Political lies, or "bunking the public" as one statesman recently described it, are common rather than uncommon, even though most men still have the decency not to admit them.

What the lack of truthfulness and honesty among politicians can do toward furthering race and class conflict is almost too terrible to contemplate. The easy promises of *a more abundant life*, of *sixty million jobs*, of a *G. I. Bill*

of Rights, the *abolition of race discrimination*, a *guaranteed annual wage*, the *Atlantic Charter*, the *war to end wars*, and many others, may all carry the seeds of bitter discord.

Therefore, American history should emphasize rather than ridicule the importance of absolute honesty as a basic American ideal. It should glorify, rather than minimize, the virtues of its heroes. It should make clear that principles, and men of principle, are the life blood of democracy and not something to be sneered at as has become fashionable in our time. It should reveal beyond a doubt that the man who said, "I would rather be right than be President," expressed the essence of Americanism: whereas the demagogue who says, "If I can get the majority to vote for me I must be right," is expressing the essence of un-Americanism.

The schools of Springfield, Massachusetts, have been carrying out a special program of education against race and religious prejudice which has won wide acclaim.⁵⁴ It is called "A Program of Education for Democracy." The very fact that such a program should be considered novel reveals the basic weakness in the teaching of American history. All education should be for democracy, but particularly American history. If American history does not give its students in the grade and high schools a clear knowledge of the moral codes on which democracy rests, then it is not being adequately taught.

The dogmas that all men are created equal and deserve equal opportunity and justice are basic elements of the American Creed. If the Springfield program can drama-

tize these ideals in terms of modern life, it will be making a great contribution to the teaching of American history. If this program were merely a superficial plan to promote a better understanding between races, it might do more harm than good. Actually, it attempts to incorporate in the regular history and civics courses the *duties and rights* of citizenship, regardless of race or creed.

Indoctrination in Americanism

The teaching of American history from a positive rather than a neutral viewpoint was recommended by Dr. Virginia C. Gildersleeve, Dean of Barnard College, in a recent address.⁵⁵ She declared that "indoctrination in the classroom, once frowned on by American educators, should be introduced in schools of this country as a method of inculcating ideals of Americanism and democracy." Furthermore, she said:

"We must reconsider our attitude about 'indoctrination.' We were not supposed to indoctrinate students. But we can learn something from the programs of the Army and Navy which have made indoctrination a good word.

"We should, in a democratic way, indoctrinate our students in the spirit as well as the facts of our history, the American tradition, and standards of conduct to promote the responsibility of good citizenship."

The Springfield Program, the Pittsburgh and Newark plans and others are important steps toward indoctrination in Americanism. However, it is impossible to reverse

the educational theories and practices of recent decades over night. At the moment, indoctrination against race prejudice is winning ground rapidly, while at the same time indoctrination to aggravate class hatreds continues almost unrecognized. To agree on the moral codes of social harmony, regardless of class, nation or race, will take time. Even to make explicit the morals of the American Creed and its definition of man's dignity is a major task.

In the meanwhile, an immediate step of great importance can be taken. This is illustrated by the action of Dr. George N. Shuster,⁵⁶ President of Hunter College, against anti-American propaganda in the classroom by the teachers. In a letter to the faculty of the college, Dr. Shuster called attention to the fact that the dissemination of subversive doctrines, race prejudice, and Fascist or Communist propaganda through the classroom was against the rules of the Board of Higher Education and not in keeping with the best ideals of American democracy. He promised to bring charges against any teacher accused of the following:

“Asserting that the Papacy and all Catholics are at heart advocates of Nazism and Fascism, and, therefore, un-American.

“Asserting that the Jewish group is a ‘race’ different from, and inferior to, other groups in the community and therefore unassimilable.

“Asserting that the Russian system of government and the Russian ideology are superior to our own, and gratuitously injecting propaganda to this effect in classroom discussion.

"Asserting that the Negro is an inferior being who can legitimately be discriminated against, either economically or socially."

In such pronouncements care should be taken not to confuse the German doctrine of Communism as stated by Karl Marx with the Russian government. The latter, while inspired by and still to a large degree embodying the Marxian ideology, is nevertheless in a process of change. However, the Communist Manifesto and the writings of Karl Marx are as definite as Adolf Hitler's *Mein Kampf*. The former are just as anti-moral in the field of class conflict as is the latter in the field of race persecution. Both employ the same technique of making a minority the scapegoat for the majority. Both are based on the doctrine that the end justifies the means, that the new order or the classless society justifies lying, stealing, violence and revolution. Hence, both are definitely un-American and should be taught as such.

Vocational or Liberal Education

The perennial controversy between the advocates of a liberal education and the advocates of a vocational education resolves itself around this claim: A liberal education is a preparation for life, whereas a vocational education is a preparation only for a job. If this were true, the least that one could expect of a liberal education is a grounding in the principles and practices of social harmony. Where, if not in the liberal arts colleges, should the concept of racial equality, not to speak of its concrete applica-

tions, be paramount? Where should the fallacies of Fascism, Communism, labor vs. capital and other doctrines of class warfare be exposed if not in these institutions?

Contrary to its avowed aim, the effect of the predominantly liberal education in the United States has been to create intellectual and moral chaos. Liberal education has encouraged each individual to work out his own code of living, his own moral order, under the naive dogma of *learning to think for oneself*. Thus it has done in the humanities the very opposite of what physical science has done in the material realm.

A Liberal Vocational Education

The devastating indictment of secondary education, growing out of the Regents Inquiry referred to above, is at the same time an admirable statement of what education for life should include. Its minimum specifications might be as follows:

1. An understanding of what work means.
2. The ability to do some job well.
3. The ability to work with others.
4. Some knowledge of available vocational opportunities and an understanding of how to obtain a job and hold it.
5. Training against race and class prejudice in the practical terms of working and community relationships.
6. Education in sound elementary economics such as will protect against economic gold bricks and mob hysteria.
7. Education in physical hygiene, competitive sports, games and the arts.

8. Education in mental hygiene and the elementary facts of personal development and social relationships.
9. Education in the duties of citizenship, community and family life.

Every one of these items involves moral values and ethical codes. To know what work means, for instance, is to know that a task must be done regardless of how one feels, that a commitment must be lived up to no matter how inconvenient, that the standards of good workmanship will be honestly followed, that tools and equipment will be conscientiously guarded, and many other things. Such a program represents vocational education in the broad, rather than the narrow, sense. Its central theme is the dignity of man in everyday life. It represents an education *in living* rather than in abstract and controversial theories of life.

Its keynote is the development of individuals, who, because they are competent and self-reliant, are immune to the propaganda of class hatreds; men and women who are free from race prejudice because they have not only been grounded in the American ideals of justice and equality but also in the practice of working harmoniously with people of all kinds.

10. THE POSSIBILITIES OF RELIGIOUS EDUCATION

MANY PEOPLE are sceptical about the efficacy of organized religion as an educational force, and rightly so. Its long retreat before the onslaughts of materialism and mechanism has seriously impaired its powers. Nevertheless, it is still the one institution uniquely equipped for effective action toward race and class harmony. This is especially true of Christianity, whose central theme, historically, has been the brotherhood of all men regardless of birth or station. This goal it has pursued for many centuries, throughout the world, with missionary and often militant zeal.

Therefore, it is not surprising that, in spite of the overwhelming scope of secular education, a nation-wide poll ⁴ of the urban population of the United States showed that 55 per cent believed that the churches and Sunday schools could do most to create race and class harmony as compared with 54 per cent who mentioned the public schools. (Many people named more than one agency.) In view of the facts we are about to relate, it is surprising that the confidence of the people in religious education is so low and in public education so high.

In recent years psychology and sociology have found some remarkable proofs of the beneficial effects of religious education. There is, for instance, the case of 10,000 adults ⁵⁷ to whom a battery of psychological tests was given during the depression years of 1933 and 1934. One

of the tests given was a test of personality traits, personality being defined as *the ability to get along with others* and its corollary, *freedom from emotional excesses*. The practical purpose of this project was to help these people find suitable jobs during the depression. However, a subsequent analysis of the data showed that *those who believed in religion or were members of a church tended to have better personalities than those who did not*.

Of couples married by civil officials, only 19.6 per cent have harmonious marital relations; on the other hand, 46 per cent of church marriages turn out well. This fact was established by Burgess and Cottrell, two sociologists who made an intensive scientific study described in their book, *Predicting Success or Failure in Marriage*.⁵⁸ They also found that attendance at church and Sunday school had an important effect on happiness in marriage. Success in marriage is one of the important signs of a good personality and emotional stability, as many psychological studies have shown.

Lewis M. Terman,⁵⁹ one of America's leading psychologists, with a group of associated psychologists, conducted an extensive study among happily and unhappily married couples. It showed that marital harmony was definitely higher among couples with a "considerable" religious training than among those with little or none.

My own nation-wide studies of personality,¹ in connection with the development of the P.Q. or Personality Quotient Test, showed that adolescents who attended Sunday school or whose parents were members of a church tended to have better personalities than those who did not. They

also demonstrated that there was no relationship between years of secular education and personality, between scholastic standing and leadership.⁶⁰

About seventy independent psychological studies⁸¹ have found that there was no relation between scholastic intelligence and personality. In other words, no matter how high a person's I.Q., his P.Q. or ability to get along with others was just as likely to be below average as above average. Furthermore, no matter how many years of formal education a person has had, his personality is just as likely to be poor as good. In other words, secular education as it is now does just as much to harm personality as to improve it.

These findings add tremendous significance to the studies which prove that religious education does tend to improve personality and social harmony. Unfortunately, studies of the influence of religion are not nearly so frequent as are studies in the field of secular education. Moreover, if our analysis of the declining influence of religion and morals in recent years is correct, future experiments will reveal that religious education contributes less to personality than it has in the past. Nevertheless, the scientific evidence at hand is sufficient to demonstrate the actual and potential superiority of religious education over present secular education in promoting social harmony.

A leading religious educator, the late Dr. John Gresham Machen of the Princeton Theological Seminary, expressed the present situation in these words: "America is running on the moral momentum from a godly ancestry."

A modern and remarkable description of the source and meaning of America's moral momentum is given by the Swedish sociologist, Gunnar Myrdal, in his survey of the Negro problem. With a brilliant marshalling of evidence and authority, he presents the American Creed and its ideals of justice and equality. In the chapter, "American Ideals and the American Conscience," he points out that this creed rests squarely on the precepts of Christianity. The solution of the Negro problem, he concludes, will come through the rediscovery and renewed application of the ideals of the American Creed.

This creed, he affirms, is the universal creed of democracy. "With minor variations, some of which, however, are not without importance, the American Creed is the common democratic creed. 'American Ideals' are just humane ideals as they have matured in our common Western civilization upon the foundation of Christianity and pre-Christian legalism. . . ." ⁶¹

Does the World Need a New Religion?

In sharp contrast to Gunnar Myrdal's conclusions is the statement of Clyde Kluckhohn, professor of anthropology at Harvard University. At the September, 1944, Conference of Science, Philosophy and Religion in Relation to the Democratic Way of Life, discussing the subject of race and group tensions, Professor Kluckhohn said: "We ought to face that fact that Christianity is a stumbling block to world adjustment. While the world desperately needs religion, we need a new religion. Or the existing re-

ligions ought to admit that there is no single way of life adequate to the needs of all human beings." *

This is typical of that anthropological viewpoint which confuses *mores* with *morals*, and local folkways with universal principles. It is a typical expression of the doctrine that morals are relative and that there can be no code of right and wrong which is the same for all nations and races. If this doctrine were fully accepted all international peace agreements and law would become meaningless. In fact, the growing acceptance of this doctrine in recent years has virtually destroyed the structure of international law. It has encouraged just such thinking as that described by Hitler as his *new order*. Hitler's *different way of life* included the persecution of the Jews, concentration camps, the Gestapo, and the Nazification of weaker nations. Now, by the same logic, Russia is justifying its way of life, its censorship, its Gestapos, its use of force and dictatorship.

If the morals of the American Creed were fully applied to the Negroes, says Myrdal, "the century-old dream of American patriots, that America should give to the entire world its own freedoms and its own faith, would come true. . . . America can demonstrate that justice, equality

* When giving permission to use this quotation, Professor Kluckhohn amplified his position as follows:

"Anthropological evidence compels the view that only in detail does each different social organization have, and need, a different morality. Certain moral principles are absolute and pan-human. But note that this is an inductive generalization. It does not rest on supernaturalism, still less upon adherence to any particular brand of supernaturalism. From the inescapable facts, anthropology draws the conclusion that the circumstances of human life are such that the survival of groups and the adjustment of individuals requires adherence to these absolute moral principles."

and cooperation are possible between white and colored people. . . . In the present phase of history this is what the world needs to believe. Mankind is sick of fear and disbelief, of pessimism and cynicism. It needs the youthful moralistic optimism of America.”⁶²

“Methodists Fight Own Racial Bias” was the headline of a newspaper article⁶³ which described the steps taken by 762 delegates to the General Conference in May, 1944, to eliminate racial discrimination throughout the Methodist Church. Many religious denominations and individual churches have taken active measures not only to eliminate discrimination in their own practices but in the fields of education, employment, housing and public facilities generally.

The National Conference of Christians and Jews has waged a vigorous campaign against bigotry. The Federal Council of Churches of Christ in America has an active Commission on Racial Relations. Catholics, Protestants and Jews alike now recognize the spiritual significance of racial issues and are taking practical steps to meet them.

The success of such actions depends entirely on the extent to which the basic morals of social harmony are inculcated in people’s minds and hearts. When church organizations actively help to pass a law like the New York State Anti-Discrimination Act, their task has only begun. Indeed, their real task may have been made more difficult, because they have tried to *force* people to do right instead of educating them to do right. The unique function of the church is to convert people through moral suasion rather than through political power. To the ex-

tent that church groups rely on political action to bring about social harmony, to that extent they are confessing their failure.

What, Then, Should the Church Schools Teach?

At various times I have had occasion to study the teaching materials of the Sunday schools of various Protestant denominations. Each time in recent years I have been impressed by the vague and muddled character of much of this material above the primary grade level. If it were not for the occasional use of certain religious stereotypes such as the words God, prayer, worship, and a few others, one might hardly recognize the subject as religion in many cases. The secular influences of modern education are overwhelmingly evident, but the result is neither good religion nor good secular education. From these studies and my own experiments with Sunday school teaching I have come to the following conclusion:

The churches and Sunday schools of America should give definite courses in American history and the American Creed. These courses should be given on the grade school, the high school and the adult level. They should be given with definite emphasis on the religious origins of America, especially the development of the American Creed and its meaning.

Such courses would supplement rather than usurp the work of the public schools. Whereas the secular schools have tended toward an economic view of American history, the church schools would emphasize its moral and spiritual values. Whereas the former have done much to

"debunk" American heroes, the church would review these heroes in the light of moral ideals. They might even give courses in the religious teachings and actions of men like Washington, Jefferson, Franklin and Lincoln. The public schools have increasingly taught American history in cold-blooded or neutral fashion, as if in fear of creating the belief that Americanism was something precious. The churches would deliberately try to create that belief, not indiscriminately, but in terms of the American ideals of fair play and equal opportunity.

In short, the church schools would systematically indoctrinate their pupils with the historic values which gave America her great moral momentum and which still constitute her unique promise for the future. Such teaching need not be narrowly nationalistic because, as Myrdal points out, "the American Creed is the common democratic creed."

One of the points which the churches should stress, especially in the more advanced courses, is the relation between the church and the government or state, as so sharply defined by our religious forefathers. The complete separation between church and state which they insisted on represents their concept of the independence of moral authority as compared with legal authority, of spiritual action as contrasted with political action. This separation represents the difference between the totalitarian state which absorbs or dominates the church, and American or English democracy in which the church places the moral law and loyalty to God even above loyalty to the state.

This separation of church and state, of moral authority

and legal authority, gives organized religion its unique function and power in dealing with the problems of human behavior such as those of race and class conflict. This function is above all one of indoctrination and education rather than of political action.

As a part of this program, the churches might well include the study of Puritanism. For many years Puritanism has been held up to scorn and ridicule. Many Puritan beliefs and *mores* deserved condemnation, but far more important are those which deserve emulation. As Professor Ralph Barton Perry of Harvard University has so well pointed out in his book, *Puritanism and Democracy*,⁵² the basic principles of Puritanism are the foundations of any successful democracy whose keynote is the dignity of the individual.

At the very heart of the American Creed is the concept of the dignity of the individual. This concept is peculiarly a religious one and should be taught as such. However, it too has succumbed to the secular influences of our age and its moral meaning has been replaced by a popular economic interpretation. Any social theorist with a grand scheme for regimenting the masses into freedom from fear and want is today likely to justify his program by an appeal to *the dignity of man*.

In discussing this modern trend with one of its strong advocates, I asked: "But what about the dignity of the individual? What about the Ten Commandments?"

"What have they to do with it?" was his instant response. "No one pays much attention to the Ten Commandments any more."

The tragedy of the world is the extent to which this statement is true. And yet, ten of the world's foremost authors described Hitler's violations of human dignity in terms of *The Ten Commandments*.¹⁶

It is true that the commandment, Thou shalt not bear false witness, has been largely forgotten. Hence the heightening of race rumors and race prejudice. It is true that the commandment: Thou shalt not covet, has been largely repudiated. Hence the heightening of class consciousness and class violence.

Jesus, who raised the concept of man's dignity to its highest level, based his doctrine squarely upon the moral law and the commandments. He announced the two great commandments not as a substitute for but as a summary of the Ten Commandments. When the rich young man asked him what he must do to win eternal life, he did not first advise him to distribute his wealth to the poor. His first advice was that he keep the commandments. Jesus did not, as do certain religious leaders of our time, define the redistribution of material wealth as a moral obligation which supersedes all other moral precepts.

No one has better exemplified our basic principle of treating human beings as such rather than as members of a class or race than did Jesus. It has been claimed that Jesus never denounced, in clear-cut fashion, the practice of racial discrimination. As a matter of fact, he went much farther. By his actions he denounced *both race and class* discrimination without making an artificial issue of either. By parable and by deed he emphasized the inherent worth of every individual, whether Jew or Gentile, Phari-

see or Saducee, rich or poor, man or woman, publican or sinner, young or old. His bitterest scorn was for those who discriminated against others because they considered themselves superior. These were the scribes and Pharisees whom he compared to "whited sepulchres" and of whom he said: "Ye shut up the kingdom of heaven against men: for ye neither go in yourselves, neither suffer ye them that are entering to go in" (Matthew 23:13).

The life and sayings of Jesus, today more than ever, should be taught as the key to true social harmony. It would be difficult, if not impossible, to find one whose actions and sayings could contribute so much to social harmony as could those of Jesus.

11. LEGISLATION, RESEARCH AND POLICY MAKING

Laws, law enforcement and political action are essential parts in any democratic program for race and class harmony. Their effectiveness, however, depends on the conscience and moral standards of the people, vaguely referred to as *public opinion*. "In any event government, Federal or State, must have the support of public opinion. . . . Ultimately government can do little without the support of that *community* public opinion. . . . I suggest that what is greatly needed is a broader and more intelligent use of the moral and educational influences of the community." Thus spoke Francis Biddle, then America's foremost law-enforcement officer, in an address, "Democracy and Racial Minorities,"⁶⁴ one of the finest short expositions of this subject which it has been the author's privilege to read.

One of the dangerous trends of our time is the use of legal force and political action as instruments of discrimination rather than of equality. Often this use is quite unconscious and motivated by the best intentions. For example, one metropolis which has had its share of race riots has begun a course to instruct its policemen in racial problems. Such a course, its advocates claim, will help the police in handling inter-racial difficulties. It is possible that it may do just the contrary.

If a policeman has to analyze and classify the problems of his beat in terms of race or class tensions, juvenile delinquency, etc., he may become a good student of social psychology but he is likely to lose his impartiality as a law-enforcement officer. If a policeman has to look to see whether a man is white or black, a striker or a non-striker, before trying to maintain order the result will be disorder. If he has to decide whether a man is Jew or Gentile before he can uphold the law intelligently the result will be chaos.

The purpose of a police force is to uphold the law impersonally, regardless of race, class or social status. If policemen, like Justice with her scales, could be blinded just enough to prevent them from distinguishing between races, between rich and poor, between union members and non-union members, they could perform their duties far more effectively.

The first principle, in any legislative or law-enforcement program, should be the emphasis on people rather than on races or classes, on individuals rather than on groups. Instead of the negative principle of trying to eliminate discrimination by emphasizing it, the guiding principle should be the positive one of equality and justice.

Existing Laws Should Be Impartially Enforced

The mistaken emphasis on race rather than on people is manifest in the widespread agitation for special laws to punish the desecrators of churches, synagogues and cemeteries, and hoodlums who attack members of another race

or religion. According to Mr. Biddle,⁶⁴ the present state laws are adequate for such crimes. However, if more laws are necessary they should be impersonal laws without reference either to race or class. A Gentile should be punished just as severely for assaulting another Gentile as for assaulting a Jew, a Negro just as severely for attacking another Negro as for attacking a white.

The real problem is not the passing of new laws but the more rigorous and impartial enforcement of existing laws.

For instance, when several automobile-loads of whites tried to burn and dynamite a building on the farm of a relocated Japanese family in California, the local sheriff put a posse on the farm for protection.⁶⁵ When a large group of white farmers forcibly ejected four Negro families which another white farmer in Missouri had brought in to work for him, fifty-three of these farmers were indicted and jailed for kidnapping and inciting to riot.

Too often, however, the attacks by members of one race or class on the members of another are excused or inadequately punished. It is argued in the courts and elsewhere that these are *social offenses* for which the *parents* or *conditions* or *society* are to blame, not the individuals. They are not personal *crimes* which should be punished in the regular way.

This is, of course, a disastrous kind of discrimination. By not punishing such crimes on the basis of equality with all other personal crimes, race riots are encouraged and their growing frequency is insured.

A large-scale demonstration of such discrimination and its consequences is the field of class and industrial conflict.

Incitement to riot by strikers and pickets has been widely ignored and even condoned. Violence by organized pickets and attacks by "flying union squads" against the persons and property of employers and non-striking employees have become increasingly immune from law enforcement. In fact, as already pointed out, some of these forms of violence have been declared legal by the Supreme Court of the United States.

So long as violence is condoned in the field of industrial conflict there is little hope for enforcing the laws against violence in the realm of race conflict. Indeed, violence in one area of human relationships breeds violence in other areas. In this country labor riots have already paved the way for race riots. The two, at times, have been indistinguishable and promise to become increasingly so. The only solution is the impersonal enforcement of laws without regard to race, class, or ideology.

In the light of present-day trends this represents a revolutionary principle. In contrast with the current emphasis on race or class this principle is positive instead of negative, constructive rather than inflammatory, democratic rather than autocratic, judicial rather than bureaucratic. Its application has been dramatically demonstrated by the December, 1944, decision of the Supreme Court denying the legality of contracts between the unions and managements of twenty-one Southern railroads by which Negroes were excluded from certain types of jobs and promotions. These railroads and the Brotherhood of Locomotive Firemen and Enginemen had entered into a collective-bargaining agreement in 1941 by which only white

men were to be promoted to serve as engineers and only "promotable" men were to be employed as firemen as new jobs became available.

About a year before the Supreme Court decision the Fair Employment Practice Committee had investigated this situation and had issued an order against this discriminatory practice. Both the unions and most of the railroads had rejected this order as unwarranted interference in their legal collective agreements. So much bitterness was generated by the resulting controversy that President Roosevelt appointed another committee to make a further study. In his letter appointing this special committee to investigate the situation already dealt with by the Fair Employment Practice Committee, Mr. Roosevelt expressed the belief: "I am sure that agreements shaped in good sense and good will can be reached."

Fortunately for this emotionally stirred up situation in the heart of the South it became unnecessary to test Mr. Roosevelt's belief. For a compromise solution between clashing personalities there was substituted an impersonal solution based on accepted judicial procedures. The Supreme Court, in two unanimous decisions in answer to actions brought by Negroes affected, on December 19, 1944, declared the discriminatory agreement between the railroads and the unions illegal. Moreover, the decisions were based squarely on the Constitution which, as the Court pointed out, imposed upon a Legislature the duty "to give equal protection to the interests of those for whom it legislates." These two decisions would seem, at one stroke, to outlaw all contracts or collective agreements between

employers and unions which discriminate against Negroes or members of any other race; or, as supported by another recent decision, which discriminate against non-union employees or members of a minority union.

On April 3, 1944, the Supreme Court ruled, by an eight to one decision, that Negroes could vote in the Texas primaries. "It may now be taken as a postulate," said the majority opinion, "that the right to vote in such a primary . . . like the right to vote in a general election is a right secured by the Constitution. . . . By the terms of the Fifteenth Amendment that right may not be abridged by a State on account of race. Under our Constitution the great privilege of choosing his rulers may not be denied a man by the State because of his color."

These decisions, while hotly resented by many, created a minimum of social hatreds. This was because they represented the accepted procedure of our republican form of democracy. They met a minimum of resistance because they were based upon the Constitution which places government by laws above government by men. These decisions bore out the principle embodied in the law of the land the emphasis of which is on *all men*, not on *some men*. In these decisions the Supreme Court has set itself a precedent for reversing some of its recent decisions which so clearly discriminate *against* non-union employees and employers.

The Case for a Permanent F.E.P.C.

The Fair Employment Practice Committee in the past has placed the emphasis on some men rather than on all

men. Its primary concern has not been fair employment practices at all, but the discrimination against minority races. It is widely urged that such a committee be established by Congress with definite legal powers. The attempt to define such powers will quickly reveal the weaknesses of this method of dealing with job discrimination. If such a committee is to be given legal powers of enforcing its findings, then the nature of the discrimination it condemns must first be defined. Agreement by Congress or any representative body of Americans on this score is today well-nigh impossible. If, because of this inability, the committee is given broad powers of discretion as to what constitutes discrimination, then it will become a kind of star-chamber court which investigates, prosecutes and condemns its victims. Even though its decisions should be made subject to review by the regular courts, its investigations and directives could still incite much race hatred. Nevertheless, such a limitation would reduce these undesirable consequences.

Applying our basic principles to this problem would lead to this solution: The Fair Employment Practice Committee would be a division of the Department of Justice and would operate under its present methods. Its first object would be to apply the existing laws to cases of illegal job discrimination. This program would reveal the adequacy as well as the inadequacy of these laws. Its function would be to extend the protection of the Constitution and the present laws in all cases of discrimination where these laws are applicable, whether this discrimination be racial or economic. Through such a program it

could not only operate most effectively but become a leader in crystallizing public opinion in behalf of a still broader program.

How Legislation Creates Discrimination and Social Strife

Before rushing to pass new legislation such as the New York State Anti-Discrimination Law, a national Fair Employment Practice Act, and others, the possible consequences should be carefully considered. Because such laws are based on the principle of discrimination they may systematically formalize and magnify race conflict. We have a perfect large-scale demonstration of this danger in the field of labor legislation.

In 1935 Congress passed the Wagner National Labor Relations Act to protect the interests of labor against certain kinds of discrimination by employers and owners. The latter were specifically enjoined from interfering with the unionization of their employees by professional union organizers or with the conduct of union affairs by local and national union officers. Employers were even denied their Constitutional right of free speech in respect to their employees. The National Labor Relations Board was established to administer this act, and has done so with missionary zeal.

The result has been to create the most highly organized and bitter class hatreds in the history of the nation. Labor, with a capital L, has been systematically educated and encouraged to hate and distrust the employing and managing group. But even further, an inevitable by-prod-

uct has been the hatreds engendered between various groups' within the laboring class, notably the battle between the C.I.O. and the A.F. of L. The obvious results have been strikes and riots over a period of years including the war years, so extensive as to mark an entirely new chapter in the history of the United States. Many of these fights were *jurisdictional*, that is, between rival unions. The employers and the public were the helpless victims.

Thus we see class conflict promoted by the undue emphasis on legislation for a particular group, in this case labor unions. Even the authors of the N.L.R. Act have admitted that it was class legislation in that it failed to give fair and equal protection to employers. Equally important is the fact that the act did not protect the general public against the excesses growing out of the privileges conferred on labor unions. While giving a free hand to professional unionizers, it did nothing to safeguard independent workmen or the public against coercion by unions.

The failure of this legislation has been acknowledged by such events as these:

The Labor Management Charter ⁶⁶ drawn up and subscribed to by the heads of the United States Chamber of Commerce, the A.F. of L. and the C.I.O.

The bill proposed in 1945 by Senators Hatch, Burton and Ball to revise existing labor laws so as to bring a "rule of law and order instead of the rule of fist and force." (The Hatch Act, passed by large majorities in the Senate and House in 1946, was vetoed by the President.)

President Truman's conference (November, 1945) be-

tween representatives of government, labor, industry and the public to bring about greater harmony.

Growing agitation for drastic new laws which will put an end to unnecessary and wasteful strikes.

The greatest wave of strikes and disputes, as I write this, since before the beginning of the war. According to the *New York Times* on October 6, 1945, there were more than two hundred strikes in progress with 491,795 workers made idle by labor disputes. In 1946 all strike records were broken.

In short, the nation has a complete case history of the consequences of purely class legislation. *If, now, we set up an equally elaborate legislative process in the field of race discrimination, we may systematically magnify the very race tension which we hope to destroy. As in the field of class conflict, we may be promoting an ideology which will transform unorganized race prejudices into highly organized race warfare.*

If, as many believe, the present laws are not adequate in respect to racial discrimination, new legislation should be adopted only after the most searching study. Let us assume that the elimination of Jim Crow cars on the railroads of the South becomes a subject for political action. Let us assume that the elimination of these cars is desirable. There would still remain these problems:

If one state abolished Jim Crow cars while adjoining states did not, the resulting confusion in crossing state lines would cause infinite friction.

If all states should at the same time outlaw Jim Crow cars without giving the railroads adequate time to revise

their equipment, the resulting crowding of whites and Negroes might lead to serious clashes.

No matter what the good will of people their mechanical habits cannot be abruptly changed without danger. Therefore, on the simple grounds of common sense, the mechanics as well as the objects of racial equality should be carefully studied. For this purpose a National Research and Policy Making Commission is desirable. This commission would not be a political action or pressure group, but a group of representative citizens entirely outside of politics whose character and ability to deal with people has been demonstrated in the fields of business, science, religion or the professions. The purpose of this commission would be to draw up long-range programs of objectives and methods, including not only legislation but other plans as well.

Good precedents for such a commission are not lacking. One of the most praiseworthy is the Commission on Interracial Cooperation which, for twenty-two years, did quiet but most effective work among the Negroes and whites in the South. Its unique record among agencies for racial harmony was due largely to its non-political character and to its emphasis on research and painstaking policy making.

This commission was merged, in February, 1944, with a new organization of broader scope, the Southern Regional Council, Inc. The purposes of this council include the related fields of racial, economic and civic improvement. It will operate through a permanent staff assisted by about one hundred scholars and by volunteer local and regional groups. If it follows the sound methods of its predecessor,

it may become an example for a similar council of nationwide scope.

A non-political council would investigate and make recommendations on such questions as:

1. What existing laws can be applied to current problems of race and class conflicts?
2. What new legislation is necessary or desirable?
3. What existing laws are so conducive to industrial and race consciousness that they should be repealed or changed?
4. When is local, State or Federal legislation most desirable?
5. What form should a particular piece of legislation take?
6. What steps, through education and other community activities, are necessary to develop the underlying conditions for race and class harmony?

Such a council might thoroughly examine the New York State Anti-Discrimination Law in order to reveal its strong and weak points for the benefit of States considering similar legislation. It might begin by asking: How does this law define job discrimination? It might expose the fact that this law condemns job discrimination *but does not define it*. In effect, it says that any union or employer who rejects a worker on the grounds of race or religion is guilty of discrimination; but it does not specify standards by which to decide whether or not this has actually been done. The decision of what constitutes punishable discrimination is entrusted to the five paid commissioners or political appointees. The commissioners, after hearing

complaints, are empowered to decide whether there has been discrimination and to order changes and punishment accordingly.

Therefore, the New York law requires its commissioners to be far more than judges. They must decide discrimination not on the facts alone but on the motives as well. The fact that a Negro was refused employment does not constitute discrimination under this law. The commissioners must find that he was rejected, not because the employer considered him incompetent, dishonest, lazy, a troublemaker, *but only because he was a Negro*. Thus the commissioners must virtually be mind readers.

They must also be management experts of unusual calibre. All employment, whether private or public, is based on discrimination. The secret of successful management is the ability to *select* the right people for the right jobs. This is one of the most complicated and difficult of all tasks. Psychologists who have been developing selection tests for many years know that they have barely scratched the surface of this problem.

An extreme example of laudable discrimination is that of a firm whose work requires great skill of hand and eye but whose employees are all physically crippled in other respects, many seriously. The morale of these employees is usually high largely because of the discrimination which prefers them to the physically whole. To build a productive organization in any field requires a fine judgment of people and jobs, that is to say, discrimination. Whether the discrimination in a particular company is humanitarian or anti-racial would have to be decided in every

case on the complex factors of the particular situation. No arbitrary or simple rules could be generally applied.

Nevertheless, the New York State commissioners must decide whether John Smith, Joe Brown, and Frank White actually had the qualifications for the specific positions which were denied them. Either they or the experts they may select will have to pit their judgment against the highly specialized knowledge and experience of successful employers in all kinds of businesses. They will have to be a hundred management experts rolled into one.

Moreover, they must decide not only with reference to technical competence but many other factors including character and compatability. Many employers have put Negroes in certain jobs only to find that the white workers made life so miserable for the Negroes that they had to quit. Thereupon, even though the employers were convinced of the technical competence of certain Negroes, they no longer dared to put them in these jobs.

However, the New York State law, while calling for the punishment of discrimination by employers and unions, *does not provide for the punishment of discrimination by fellow employees*. The boycotting of fellow employees can be such a subtle process that neither the employers, unions, or the commissioners could often prove its existence. And yet, both employers and union officers may be its victims. This makes it all the more difficult for the commissioners to fix responsibility on either employers or unions.

Because the New York State law leaves the decision of

when unlawful discrimination has taken place almost entirely to its commissioners, a non-political council might well point out that it was more an instrument of prejudice than of justice, a political device rather than a judicial procedure. The commissioners are political appointees of the governor and the senate which means that they may be good or poor. No matter how good they are, they will be human beings who belong to some race or religion and are themselves subject to initial bias. It is difficult enough for a judge with many years training in the law and judicial procedure to make reasonably fair decisions. It will be infinitely more difficult for these commissioners.

One of the chief tasks of a non-political council on race and class harmony should be to list and define immoral forms of discrimination, not only in respect to jobs but elsewhere. Every phase of life involves discrimination, from the choice of a wife to the choice of an undertaker. By immoral discrimination we mean discrimination solely on racial grounds or membership in a union or class.

This is by no means an easy task. Some forms of immoral discrimination, such as Jim Crow railroad cars, are obvious. Many forms of discrimination are not nearly so obvious or so easy to define. And yet, if they cannot be clearly defined, they cannot be adequately dealt with through legislation or legal force.

The more extensive the attempts to legislate race and class equality the more obvious the limitations of this method become. Therefore, the council should be concerned with policy making on the broadest possible basis.

It should include not only the problems of race discrimination but those of class conflict as well. It should, as former Mayor LaGuardia asked of a fine "Committee on Unity" ⁶⁷ which he appointed in 1944, "maintain a qualified staff to make studies for it so that any pronouncements and reports it may make from time to time will have a solid foundation in the facts."

One of the greatest needs in this field is less heat and more light. A kind of research which has already demonstrated its usefulness are the public-opinion polls. The *Fortune* magazine poll under Elmo Roper, the Gallup Poll, the polls of the National Opinion Research Center of the University of Denver, and the polls of the Psychological Corporation under the author's direction have all uncovered helpful information in regard to race prejudice. They have also accumulated an enormous fund of basic data in respect to class warfare and economic differences.

However, such polls, though reliable in measuring trends of opinion and feeling, are not very reliable in discovering or evaluating causes. "New Methods Used to Fight Race Bias" was the headline of an article in the *New York Times*, November 1, 1945, reporting the use of a more intensive research by the Commission on Community Interrelations. This research combined the methods of several sciences including psychology and sociology. In one case a task force of fifteen trained people was sent into the critical area and conducted "deep level" interviews with 212 family heads, talking with each one for hours at a time to discover their "gripes" and desires. Their findings were then organized and translated into terms of a

community program which has done much to ameliorate the situation.

This use of research is not without its dangers, especially in the hands of overzealous reformers. Nevertheless, it is far superior to attempts at reform without any research.

12. A PLEA FOR RELIGIOUS INTOLERANCE

JESUS' GREAT TOLERANCE with people of all kinds was matched by a corresponding intolerance of evil. His tolerance was positive rather than negative, since it rested on an uncompromising belief in the moral law.

Probably the greatest weakness of education, including religious education, has been its deification of *toleration, as such*. Parents have been taught to be tolerant with their rebellious children, teachers with their undisciplined pupils; husbands and wives with those who broke up their homes; the courts with unquestioned offenders; the churches with divorce, gambling and the material excesses of modern life; people possessed of moral principles or standards with those who had none.

Tolerance and broad-mindedness, often referred to as liberalism, has been the shibboleth of our intellectual age. The result is that we have almost lost our sense of right and wrong, that we are now drifting in a chaotic world without compass, sextant or map. Even the churches have been too much concerned with being broad-minded or liberal and not enough with being right. Hence they have largely lost their great strength, the power of moral indignation and leadership.

We have become so broad-minded that nothing matters much and so tolerant that we can be indifferent toward almost anything. Among other things, we have become indifferent to the meaning of the American Creed and its

full application to the Negroes. We were also indifferent to Italy's invasion of Ethiopia and Japan's invasion of China. We were very tolerant of Germany's persecution of the Jews. Having become so broad-minded about the Ten Commandments at home, it was not surprising that Germany's wholesale coveting, stealing, lying and killing evoked so little indignation among Americans. Until we were attacked by Japan, over eighty per cent of our population, according to the polls, preferred the comforts of our war prosperity to actual war on Germany.

We had become so tolerant and broad-minded that when we were finally forced into the war it was without definite moral objectives. Now we have emerged with objectives still uncertain and with the added burden of confusion which we have thrust upon the *liberated* countries. Our most important wish is expressed in the slogan: "*It must not happen again.*" In the hope for permanent peace we have pressed toward an international peace organization *at any cost*. We have staked our hopes on this organization and for its sake *have already begun to tolerate the very cruelties and oppressions which we fought to destroy*. We are prepared to be more broad-minded, more liberal, more appeasing, than ever.

The Christian virtue of forgiveness is one thing but the toleration and appeasement of evil is quite another. Religious education is worse than no education at all if it fails to uphold definite standards of right and wrong. Jesus taught "as one having authority and not as the Scribes," the intellectuals of his time. And in the third chapter of Revelations we read:

He that hath an ear, let him hear what the Spirit saith unto the churches:

And unto the angel of the church of the Laodiceans write; These things saith the Amen, the faithful and true witness, the beginning of the Creation of God;

I know thy works, that thou art neither cold nor hot: I would thou wert cold or hot.

So then because thou art lukewarm, and neither cold nor hot, I will spew thee out of my mouth.

The churches have become less lukewarm in respect to race conflict but in respect to class warfare they have remained almost completely tolerant.

The attitude of the Protestant Church, until recently, has been that she must avoid interfering in political and economic matters. The Roman Catholic Church has been criticized by Protestants as concerning herself too much with political problems. The confusion is caused by the failure to distinguish between the political and the moral. Where moral issues are concerned, no church can afford to remain aloof or tolerant, no matter what the political involvement.

For example, when the Supreme Court of the United States rendered its unanimous decision permitting union pickets to make slanderous statements about a restaurant owner (see Chapter 4) it was the obligation of the churches to rise in unity and proclaim:

The decision of the Supreme Court of the land stating that "to use loose language or unrefined slogans that are part of the conventional give-and-take in our economic and political controversies—like 'unfair' or 'Fascist'—is not to falsify the facts" may be legally and technically cor-

rect. But, according to the moral law, such a practice is wrong and indefensible. The highest court may declare the use of such epithets to be merely the give-and-take of our economic and political controversies as the terms "kike," "dago," and "sheeny" are of our racial controversies. Nevertheless, a law higher than that made by any political court condemns such language whether used by unions, employers or any one else. Such practice is bad enough when indulged in by impulsive individuals, but is far worse when followed as the deliberate policy of a highly organized and legally protected group.

The Congress of the United States may or may not change the law to rectify this immoral and unjust condition. In the meanwhile all churches and people loyal to the religious concept of man's dignity and the brotherhood of man, regardless of economic station or political beliefs, reaffirm their loyalty to the great law: Thou shalt not bear false witness against thy neighbor.

When the Supreme Court finally condemned the sit-down strike technique as practised in the great automobile strike in Detroit in 1937, the churches should have acclaimed the decision as a vindication of the moral law. Indeed, they should themselves have condemned sit-down strikes at the time of their occurrence as immoral acts in the promoting of class warfare; just as, in many years preceding, they should have condemned as immoral the degradation of workers to the level of robots on a conveyor belt. Here, and in many other fields of mass production, the dignity of man was and still is being tragically sacrificed for materialistic ends. That the process took place with the consent both of workers and employers does not alter its profound effects on the creation of class warfare.

When a recent series of Supreme Court decisions (see Chapter 4) declared that stealing, violence, and the deliberate ruining of a man's business, when done by unions under certain circumstances, were not illegal, the churches should have marshalled their complete powers of moral intolerance. They should have declared that, no matter what the legal technicalities, it was just as wrong for unions to steal, persecute and commit violence as it was for employers or any other individuals.

Such intolerance need not be expressed primarily as a condemnation of labor unions or of any other group as such. It should be the disapproval of immorality as such. It should be a dogmatic stand on the basic moral laws which, when violated, create either class warfare, race conflict, or personal crime. It is just because the churches have been so tolerant of the violations of the basic commandments in the field of personal behavior generally that they now find it difficult to condemn these same violations in the larger areas of social conflict.

When, as has happened in recent years, Jewish temples and Catholic shrines are desecrated by vandals, the fervent plea has been for greater religious tolerance. The plea should have been for greater religious intolerance. All sects have been too lax in respect to the elementary morals toward which, regardless of creed, they should have presented a united front. They should have been consistently intolerant with all forms of vandalism against the persons and property of others. From the stoning of factories, shops and workers' homes to the desecration of churches is only a small step.

But, as Marx pointed out, the proletariat cannot be emancipated so long as it is Christian any more than the Jew can be emancipated so long as he clings to his religion. Many Jews have now been *emancipated*, to misuse the word, from their religion. That is to say, they have freed themselves from the compelling authority of their greatest contribution to civilization, the moral law. *They have been emancipated from the one great force which stood between them and persecution, the Ten Commandments.*

Instead of their plea for greater tolerance, the Jews today might well reaffirm their moral charter for the world. They might well proclaim, with the righteous wrath of a Moses, that no matter what the social system, whether capitalism or socialism, democracy or communism, the Ten Commandments are the only power which can ultimately assure the dignity of the Jews, or of any race, class, or individual. They might justifiably point out that Germany, and now all Europe, is the laboratory demonstrating this truth.

The Significance of the New Social Gospel

The Christian churches, under the secular influences already described, are also being emancipated from the authority of the Ten Commandments. But what is still more significant, an important minority, especially in the Protestant denominations, has systematically if unwittingly encouraged their violation.

A leader in this minority was the late William Temple,⁶⁸ Archbishop of Canterbury and head of the Episcopal

Church of England. Speaking in 1942 before 6,000 workers in the Albert Hall, a mass meeting organized by the Industrial Christian Fellowship, he advocated a socialized economy.⁶⁹ Speaking of material goods, he said: “. . . of these, so far as they are purely material, it is true to say that the more one has, the less there is for others, so *that each man's success represents corresponding failure in his neighbors.*” (italics ours) That is to say, if a man has less than his neighbor it is so not necessarily through any fault of his own but because that neighbor has obtained more than his share. If one man catches ten fish and another only one, the latter's failure is due to the former's success.

Whatever the truth of the Archbishop's premise, and it is basically false, it is an incitement to class warfare of the most inflammatory kind. It says, in effect: *you should not only covet your neighbor's wealth but you should take steps to get your just share of it.*

This Social Gospel is a far more subtle provocation to class hatreds than the preachings of Marx and Hitler which were based on exactly the same premise. Marx claimed that the capitalists grew rich entirely at the expense of the wage earners, and Hitler condemned the Jews for having obtained their wealth at the expense of the German working class. But whereas Marx and Hitler proposed the redistribution of wealth in spite of religious morals, the new Social Gospel calls for this redistribution as a religious crusade. “*In the name of God and the Kingdom of Heaven on earth,*” it says, “*let us take the wealth of the exploiters who have it and distribute it among those who have less: Let us, as Christians, do this with as little*

injustice and violence as possible. We do not have to steal or kill to effect this redistribution if we use the democratic process of the popular ballot!"

This, with minor variations, is the new Social Gospel or *Christian Socialism* of a powerful collection of highly organized minorities in the churches throughout the world. "Challenging the Enemy," read the heading of a pamphlet distributed by one of these "social service" church groups. The "Enemy" were the owners of property and the pamphlet went on to say:

"It doesn't take long to write 'Transfer . . . from private property to social ownership.'

"But start to do it! Then you run into laws that were made to stop you. Little laws about disorderly conduct and obstructing traffic.

"Big laws about taking property without reasonable compensation.

"Bigger laws about advocating the overthrow of government by voice and violence.

"And behind these laws are policemen, sheriffs, soldiers—with clubs, tear gas, machine guns.

"And behind them are judges who interpret laws and constitutions in terms of the property rights of the people they've grown up with.

"And behind the judges are prisons and electric chairs.

"Yes, it's a man's job to challenge the profit system. . . .

"But when were Americans—pioneers and children of pioneers, in a big land—*afraid of a big job?*"

This inflammatory statement may be an extreme example, but it emphasizes the elements which are common to many forms of the new Social Gospel. These are the arti-

ficial redistribution of wealth, the abolition of the *profit system*, and the substitution of State ownership for private ownership, that is, Socialism.⁷⁰

Whatever the desirability of these objectives, and they are open to question to say the least, the basic appeal of this gospel is to the covetousness of the masses and to their feelings of envy and hatred for the rich. With perfect Marxian technique, a property-owning minority is made the scapegoat for the majority who own less.

How Communism and the Social Gospel Differ

It is not surprising, therefore, that so many people confuse Communism with the new Social Gospel. The Social Gospel, its advocates admit, has much in common with Communism. The one basic difference between them, historically, is that *Christian Socialism* seeks to retain God and organized religion, whereas classical Communism seeks to abolish them.

Communism describes God and the church as a hindrance to class warfare. The advocates of the Social Gospel promote class warfare in the name of God and the church. The former advocates a violent revolution if necessary, the latter a peaceful revolution if possible. Communism aims to destroy the capitalist minority no matter what killing, stealing, lying, and covetousness are required. The Social Gospel calls for the destruction of this minority by the more peaceful means of the popular vote, to put it bluntly, by *socialized* covetousness, stealing, and the bearing of false witness. It would eliminate capitalists as a

class, regardless of individual fault or merit, for the *assumed* profit of the common man regardless of his individual fault or merit.

In short, while Marx and Lenin preached class hatreds consciously and deliberately in the name of a *classless* society, these religious minorities advocate the same ends by the subterfuge of a holy crusade. No matter how sincere their motives, their methods are psychologically perfect for the creation of class hatreds and industrial warfare. They have raised the scapegoat technique of Marx and Hitler to its ultimate refinement.

The dogmatic and intolerant program of this religious minority has been directly facilitated by the laxness and tolerance of the majority. There have been comparatively few religious leaders in the recent life of America who have condemned the appeal to covetousness as did the late Alfred E. Smith. Speaking during the presidential campaign of 1936, he said:

"This is no time for demagogues . . . there is always the temptation to some men to stir up the bitterness of the rich against the poor, and of the poor against the rich. Against that effort, I set myself uncompromisingly. . . . I will take off my coat and fight to the end against any candidate who persists in any demagogic appeal to the masses of the working people of the country to destroy themselves by setting class against class and rich against poor."

Outstanding among the few religious leaders who have condemned the preaching of class hatreds in the name of religion has been Pope Pius XII.⁷¹ In his messages to the

world on September 1 and December 25, 1944, and in subsequent messages, he condemned not only the methods but the aims of Communism as being directly opposed to those of the Catholic Church. In January, 1945, the Vatican explicitly repudiated the so-called "Christian Left" party.⁷² This party was originally the Catholic Communist party which the Pope and the Vatican had repudiated in clear terms. To meet that condemnation it had changed its name but had retained its adhesion to Marxism and Communism in general. Therefore, the Vatican condemned its principles, its tendencies and its right to represent Christian thought or to seek Catholic members.

Until the majority of Protestant, Catholic and Jewish religious leaders repudiate the gospel of hatred, no matter under what name it parades, there can be little hope for social harmony. Until this majority becomes intolerant of the scapegoat technique in the field of class conflict as well as in the field of race conflict, there can be peace in neither. Until it insists that the second commandment, Love thy neighbor, cannot be kept without keeping the Ten Commandments, there can be little hope for peace of any kind.

The Futility of Conferences without Principles

One of the great bromides and fallacies of our time is the belief that any quarrel can be settled if the disputing parties will get together and discuss it over the conference table. In the realm of industrial conflict, the conference method has become the universal panacea. The result has been more and more disputes and more and more

bureaus to mediate such disputes. Accepted as an instrument for creating class harmony, this method has become one of the most potent factors in aggravating the class struggle *and every other form of conflict*.

The essence of the prevailing conference method is not discussion but compromise. It is the mechanism of appeasement which substitutes expedients for morals. It is a method of bargaining in which power is substituted for principles. Issues are not settled, they are merely postponed or glossed over by a temporary concession or a high-sounding verbal formula. Now we have gone so far as to put our trust in the conference method for achieving lasting peace. Having participated in the destruction of the older international law, we now hope to create new international laws, from meeting to meeting!

Possibly the churches should not participate in industrial, political and international disputes, but they cannot ignore the moral aspects of such disputes. It is their duty to proclaim, dogmatically and intolerantly, that no conference which lacks basic moral principles of right and wrong will arrive at decisions conducive to harmony. It is their duty to affirm that no amount of talking or bargaining which ignores the ideals of justice and fair play can hope to achieve permanent peace.

The opening of the San Francisco Peace Conference in 1945 without prayer aroused a protest from some religious leaders. However, it was the insistent voice of a United States Senator, and not that of the churches, which, almost at the last minute, succeeded in introducing the concept of justice into our country's program. Up to then, we

were entering the conference merely as one of the important horse traders, bargaining for concessions in respect to European governments and their boundaries.

This incident demonstrated how far the United States had gone in abandoning its historic ideals of justice for the methods of expediency. Even though paying them lip service at the last minute, we agreed to injustices to nations of the very kind we had condemned in Germany. The *bargaining* method, the method of compromise, which we ourselves had developed to such a high point in the field of labor and industrial disputes, became our greatest weakness at the peace conference. Having all but abandoned the mighty power of moral principles, we were reduced to the level of a pawn in the play of power politics.

The churches cannot contribute to social harmony unless they insist that certain principles are not subject to bargaining or arbitration, either by management, labor, or governments. About their creeds, forms and rituals church denominations may differ and be tolerant with impunity; but on basic morals affecting the conflicts between races, classes and individuals, they must either agree or lose what is left of their influence.

The weakness of organized religion today lies not in the variety of its denominations and creeds but in its lack of moral unity and certainty.

The great and most immediate task of the churches is to resurrect and to reinterpret the universal morals of personal and social conduct. A common faith without a common ethics is mere wishful thinking. A God without Commandments is worse than no God at all.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. LINK, HENRY C. *The Rediscovery of Man*. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1937.
2. "Scholars Confess They Are Confused." *New York Times*, September 1, 1942.
3. DE TOCQUEVILLE, ALEXIS. *Democracy in America*. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, Inc., 1945.
4. LINK, HENRY C. The Tenth Nationwide Social Survey. *Jl. of Applied Psych.* Vol. XXVIII, No. 5, October 1944.
5. Fortune Polls. *Fortune* magazine. August 1938; January 1939; July 1939; September 1942; September 1943.
6. National Opinion Research Center of the University of Denver. August 1944; July 1944.
7. BROWN, F. J. and ROUCEK, J. S. *One America*. New York: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1945.
8. HEIDEN, KONRAD. *Der Fuehrer, 1848-1934*, translated by Ralph Mannheim. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1944.
9. LEE, ALFRED McCLUNG and HUMPHREY, NORMAN D. *Race Riot*. New York: The Dryden Press, 1943.
10. Conference on Science, Philosophy and Religion. *Approaches to National Unity*. New York: Harper & Brothers, 1945.
11. "Scholars Agree on Way to Peace." *New York Times*, September 12, 1944.
12. BROGAN, D. W. *The American Character*. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, Inc., 1944.
13. MYRDAL, GUNNAR. *An American Dilemma*. New York: Harper & Brothers, 1944.
14. DEWEY, JOHN. *Freedom and Culture*. New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons, 1939.
15. LINK, HENRY C. *The Return to Religion*. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1935.

16. MANN, THOMAS, and nine other authors. *The Ten Commandments*. New York: Simon and Schuster, Inc., 1943.
17. BEARD, CHARLES A. and MARY R. *Basic History of the United States*. New York: New Home Library, 1944.
18. U. S. Dept. of Labor, Children's Bureau. *Preliminary Statement, Juvenile Court Statistics*, 1943. February 28, 1944.
19. Federal Bureau of Investigation. *Uniform Crime Reports*. 1933-1944.
20. "Let's Face the Race Question." *Bulletin of America's Town Meeting of the Air*. New York: February 17, 1944.
21. ODUM, H. W. *Race and Rumors of Race*. Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press, 1943.
22. Dept. of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics: *Monthly Labor Review*, 1937-1945.
23. GARRETT, GARET. *The Revolution Was*. Caldwell, Idaho: The Caxton Printers, Ltd., 1944.
24. BENEDICT, RUTH and WELTFISH, GENE. *The Races of Mankind*. New York: Public Affairs Committee, Inc., 1943.
25. HIRSCH, N. D. M. "A Study of Nation-Racial Mental Differences." *Genetic Psych. Monogs.* 1:233-406, 1926.
26. BYRNS, R. "Intelligence and Nationality of Wisconsin School Children." *J. Soc. Psych.*, 1937, 7, 455-470.
27. KLINEBERG, OTTO, with six other authors. *Scientific Aspects of the Race Problem*. Washington: The Catholic University Press, 1941.
28. LINK, HENRY C. "What Is Intelligence?" *Atlantic Monthly*, September 1923.
29. GARRETT, HENRY E. "A Note on the Intelligence Scores of Negroes and Whites in 1918." *Jl. Ab. and Soc. Psych.*, July 1945.
30. GARTH, T. R. *Race Psychology: A Study of Racial Mental Differences*. New York, 1931; also other publications.
31. LINK, HENRY C. and ROSLOW, SYDNEY. "Personality and Intellect." Unpublished.
32. McDUGALL, WILLIAM. *Is America Safe for Democracy?* New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1921.
33. NEFF, W. S. "Socio-Economic Status and Intelligence." *Psych. Bull.* 1938, 35, 727-757.

34. MYERS, HENRY ALONZO. *Are Men Equal*. New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons, 1945.
35. DE TOCQUEVILLE, ALEXIS. *Democracy in America*, Vol. II, p. 138.
36. COREY, LEWIS. "Problems of the Peace: The Middle Class." *The Antioch Review*, Vol. V, No. 1, 1945.
37. LANGMUIR, IRVING. Joint Hearings on Science Bills Before Senate Military Officers and Commerce Committees, October 8, 1945.
38. COHEN, DAVID L. "How the South Feels." *Atlantic Monthly*, January 1944.
39. The American Council on Race Relations, A. A. Liveright, Ex. Dir., 31 Randolph St., Chicago, Ill., January 15, 1945.
40. National Resources Planning Board. "Bill of Rights." *New York Times*, March 11, 1943.
41. *Monthly Summary of Events and Trends in Race Relations*. Nashville, Tenn.: Social Science Institute, Fisk University.
42. "Tolerance Can Be Fun." *Sunday Herald-Tribune*, April 30, 1944.
43. LINK, HENRY C. "The Errors of Psychiatry." *American Mercury*, July 1944. LINK, HENRY C. *The Rediscovery of Man*, Ch. VI. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1939.
44. DAVENPORT, WALTER. "Three Viewpoints on the Negro Problem in America." *New York Times Book Review*, November 14, 1943.
45. *U. S. Office of Education Bulletin*, 1940, No. 2, Chapters IV and V.
46. The Metropolitan Life Insurance Co. *Statistical Bulletin*, October 1943.
47. COHEN, ALFRED. "Statistical Analysis of American Divorce." *Studies in History, Economics and Public Law*, Columbia University, No. 360.
48. Federal Bureau of Investigation. *Uniform Crime Report*, 1936-1944.
49. Department of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics. Bulletin No. 651, *Strikes in the U. S. 1880-1936: Monthly Labor Review*, 1937-1945.

50. GULICK, LUTHER. The Regents Inquiry. *Better Schools*, December 1939.
51. MERRILL, KENNETH H. "An Ex-Marine Looks at High School." *Saturday Evening Post*, December 9, 1944.
52. PERRY, RALPH BARTON. *Puritanism and Democracy*. New York: The Vanguard Press, 1944.
53. *New York Times*, April 4, 1943.
54. CHATTO, C. L. and HALLIGAN, ALICE L. *The Story of the Springfield Plan*. New York: Barnes & Noble, Inc., 1945.
55. GILDERSLEEVE, V. C. "Education in Americanism." *New York Journal-American*, November 18, 1944.
56. "Shuster Warns Hunter Faculty Against Classroom Propaganda." *New York Times*, February 15, 1944.
57. BERGEN, GARRET L. *Ten Thousand Clients of the Adjustment Service*. American Ass'n for Adult Education, New York, 1935.
58. BURGESS, E. W. and COTTRELL, L. S. *Predicting Success or Failure in Marriage*, pp. 122 f. New York: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1939.
59. TERMAN, LEWIS M. *Psychological Factors in Marital Happiness*, pp. 230 f. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1938.
60. ROSLOW, SYDNEY. "Nation-wide Validation of the P.Q. or Personality Quotient Test." *Jl. of Applied Psych.* Vol. XXIV, No. 5, October 1940.
61. MYRDAL, GUNNAR. *An American Dilemma*. Vol. I, p. 24. New York: Harper & Brothers, 1944.
62. *Ibid.* Vol II, pp. 1021-22.
63. "Methodists Fight Own Racial Bias." *New York Times*, May 6, 1944.
64. BIDDLE, FRANCIS. "Democracy and Racial Minorities." Address before the Jewish Theological Seminary of America, November 11, 1943.
65. "Sheriff Puts Posse on Japanese Farm." *New York Times*, January 21, 1945.
66. JOHNSTON, ERIC A. *New Charter for Labor Management*. Washington, March 28, 1945.
67. "Racial Unity Group Created by Mayor." *New York Times*, February 28, 1944.

68. TEMPLE, WILLIAM, Archbishop of Canterbury. *The Church Looks Forward*. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1943.
69. "Canterbury Calls for State Credit." *New York Times*, September 27, 1942.
70. BARTLETT, ARTHUR. "Churchmen Crusade Against Capitalism." *American Magazine*, September 1938.
71. POPE PIUS XII. "Radio Address on Fifth Anniversary of World War II." *New York Times*, September 2, 1944.
72. "Vatican Repeats Communism Stand." *New York Times*, January 2, 1945.

Copyright data of quotations borrowed and the pages on which they appear: 28, 105: © 1945 by Alfred A. Knopf, Inc., 33: © 1944 by Houghton Mifflin Co.; 41: © 1939 by G. P. Putnam's Sons; 75: © 1943 by The University of North Carolina Press; 83: © 1945 by *Jl. Ab. and Soc. Psych.*; 117-18: © 1945 by *The Antioch Review*; 123-24: © 1944 by *The Atlantic Monthly*; 163: © 1944 by *The Saturday Evening Post*; 181-83, 185: © 1944 by Harper & Brothers.